

## AMENDMENT TO ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment proposing to reappoint officers of the Army who were mustered out without a hearing under General Orders No. 1, January 2, 1871, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill (H. R. 20347), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

## OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

## RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Thursday, January 28, 1915) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 29, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 28, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, deliver us from the superstitions which make cowards of us all, the sins which make us slaves, and lift us into the higher realms of thought and purity, that we may worship Thee in spirit and in truth, think our own thoughts, act our own volitions, and harmonize our souls with Thy will. In the Christ spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY AND SATURDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the passage of the naval appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, Friday, and that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Saturday morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow, and that when it adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. Saturday. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is intended to bring on the naval appropriation bill right immediately following the disposal of the Agricultural bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. If we finish the Agricultural bill to-day at an early enough hour, I think the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs expects to take up the naval appropriation bill to-day.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs? I notice that he is not here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. I am making the request at his suggestion.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it the desire of the gentleman from Alabama and that of the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that the naval appropriation bill shall follow this bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Speaker arranges how the bills shall come in. My understanding is that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will be recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. MANN. I suppose that is a matter between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT]. We might be able to run in the pension appropriation bill at some odd moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair takes these bills up in the order in which they are reported, unless there is some good reason for acting otherwise upon them.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, acting on the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I suggest that the Naval appropriation bill, if ready, shall follow the Agricultural bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Speaker has not put the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Assuming that it is on the subject of rural credits, is that to print a lot of stuff in the RECORD?

Mr. BULKLEY. It is for printing some information on the subject of rural credits.

Mr. MANN. It is not newspaper clippings and the like?

Mr. BULKLEY. No. It is careful work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

## DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Salaries, Division of Publications: One editor, who shall be chief of division, \$3,250; 1 editor, who shall be assistant chief of division, \$2,500; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 2 assistant editors, at \$2,000 each; 4 assistant editors, at \$1,800 each; 1 assistant editor, \$1,600; 1 assistant editor, \$1,400; 1 assistant editor in charge of indexing, \$2,000; 1 indexer, \$1,400; 1 assistant in charge of illustrations, \$2,100; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,600 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,500 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,400 each; 1 draftsman or photographer, \$1,300; 6 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,200 each; 1 assistant photographer, \$900; 1 assistant in charge of document section, \$2,000; 1 assistant in document section, \$1,800; 1 foreman, miscellaneous distribution, \$1,500; 1 forewoman, \$1,400; 1 clerk, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 9 clerks, class 1; 16 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 40 clerks, at \$900 each; 18 clerks, at \$840 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 8 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 4 skilled laborers, at \$780 each; 16 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; 1 folder, \$1,000; 2 folders, at \$900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 messengers, at \$720 each; 3 messengers or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at \$420 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 laborer, \$840; 2 laborers, at \$600 each; 4 charwomen, at \$480 each; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$174,750.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed in dealing with this particular bureau of the Department of Agriculture that they have a system of writing a letter, written on a typewriter by some clerk, signed by the Chief of the Bureau of Publications, in response to every addressed frank that is sent to them requesting that a publication be sent to any person in the United States. I have frequently gotten as high as a dozen or 20 of these in a single morning in response to addressed franks sent out by my clerk.

Now, it seems to me that that is a great deal of labor, to write a letter of some five or six lines on a typewriter, merely to tell me that the addressed frank has been used and that the publication has been sent. It may be a matter of very trifling interest to me and not of very great interest to the man who receives it. Still he is entitled to the Government publication, and I am glad to send it to him, and sometimes it is of value. But it does not seem to me that it is necessary to write a letter about it.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. RUBEX. I have received some of these acknowledgments in which they acknowledge receipt of a number of franks all at once.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and so have I. Sometimes they combine several in one letter.

Mr. RUBEX. Is not that because you combine several franks in one request?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; that may be.

Mr. RUBEX. If you put all the requests in one letter, you will probably get one acknowledgment for them all.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; but that depends on how my clerk sends them out, or it depends on whether I get the requests all at the same time. But the main point is that, so far as the department is concerned, it is useless to write a letter of that kind at all. It seems to me a blank form or a little printed slip would do just as well, if any acknowledgment is necessary.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, that is just what I was going to suggest to the gentleman, that a printed form slip would serve every purpose and save the time of at least one stenographer, and I should think of half a dozen, which it must take to reply to the receipt of these address blanks sent by the Members of Congress. That work must take the time of several employees in this department, and I think the suggestion of the gentleman is a wise one.

Mr. BORLAND. In view of the fact that there are 437 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate, manifestly one stenographer can not attend to that business, if it is all done on the same scale as it is in regard to my requests.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied the suggestion of the gentleman will be taken under consideration by the officials in charge of the work. It is a good suggestion.

Mr. BORLAND. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes, and not to talk on the particular item that is before the committee, but on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, without confining his remarks to this particular paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, on page 2265 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25 the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] said:

The statement has been made several times on the floor of the House carrying inferences that there was some sectionalism in this bill in the expenditure of the money carried by it. In order that the country may have the facts, I want to ask unanimous consent in this connection to publish some figures issued by the Department of Agriculture showing the expenditure of funds by sections.

In the course of the colloquy which followed I reserved the right to object to the unanimous consent, in order to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina how the divisions referred to in which the money was distributed were made, and inquired if the statement was to show the expenditures by States, to which the gentleman from South Carolina replied, "No; not by States."

I was curious to see whether there was, as a matter of fact, any sectionalism in the distribution of the funds, and I have taken the pains to make an analysis of the distribution of the appropriations covered by the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The analysis of the expenditures is interesting and instructive. I am sure it will throw light upon the manner in which the money is distributed. Here it is:

*Appropriations in Agricultural bill for 1914 and 1915.*

States.	Excepting Forest Service and Weeks law.		Including Forest Service and Weeks law.	
	1914	1915	1914	1915
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.....	\$885,692.88	\$1,190,412.70	\$1,508,365.81	\$1,426,243.70
New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.....	1,194,013.60	1,361,927.84	1,202,783.60	1,369,714.84
Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin.....	1,771,953.78	2,261,669.71	1,922,098.78	2,420,678.67
Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas.....	1,939,529.63	2,395,493.02	2,092,038.63	2,551,281.02
Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.....	1,450,381.69	1,963,220.59	1,731,404.21	2,459,850.5

*Appropriations in Agricultural bill—Continued.*

States.	Excepting Forest Service and Weeks law.		Including Forest Service and Weeks law.	
	1914	1915	1914	1915
Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi....	\$677,691.04	\$967,896.55	\$726,348.48	\$1,963,053.55
Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.....	1,037,477.71	1,364,231.20	1,121,566.71	1,449,509.20
Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada.....	1,109,691.03	1,390,148.73	4,156,263.03	4,539,875.73
Washington, Oregon, and California.....	793,356.92	989,234.36	2,503,238.92	2,701,522.36
Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam.....	131,736.19	147,241.09	180,631.19	196,618.09
Washington, D. C.....	4,111,572.54	4,466,469.81	4,555,287.54	4,931,577.81

*SUMMARY.*

Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas (15 Southern States).....	\$3,103,389.00	\$4,223,316.04	\$3,517,157.96	\$7,933,096.04
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam (33 Northern States, and Territorial and insular possessions).	7,825,974.03	9,736,127.45	13,566,317.96	15,205,951.41

<sup>1</sup> Decrease, \$82,122.11.

<sup>2</sup> Increase, \$157,532.24.

<sup>3</sup> Increase, \$497,679.89.

<sup>4</sup> Increase, \$459,242.39.

<sup>5</sup> Increase, \$2,828,455.38.

<sup>6</sup> Increase, \$1,239,705.07.

<sup>7</sup> Increase, \$327,942.49.

<sup>8</sup> Increase, \$383,612.70.

<sup>9</sup> Increase, \$198,292.44.

<sup>10</sup> Increase, \$15,986.90.

<sup>11</sup> Increase, \$376,290.27.

<sup>12</sup> Increase, \$1,119,927.04.

<sup>13</sup> Increase, \$4,415,938.08.

<sup>14</sup> Increase, \$1,910,153.42.

<sup>15</sup> Increase, \$1,539,633.45.

The grouping of the States by the department is ingenious, and unless one made a comprehensive study of the expenditures under that grouping it would not be possible to tell how one section of the country is discriminated against in favor of another, but I feel sure that with this analysis no one will have any difficulty in reaching the conclusion that there is such discrimination.

For example, the analysis shows that Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut received \$82,122.11 less in the current law than they did for the fiscal year 1914.

New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania received \$157,932.24 more in 1915 than in 1914.

Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, \$497,679.89 more.

Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, \$459,242.39 more.

Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida received \$2,828,455.38 more in 1915 than in 1914.

Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi received \$1,239,705.07 more.

Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas received \$327,942.49 more.

Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada received \$383,612.70 more.

Washington, Oregon, and California received \$198,292.44 more.

Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam, \$15,986.90 more.

Washington, D. C., received an increase of \$376,290.27 over 1914.

Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, 15 Southern States, received \$3,517,157.96 in the 1914 Agricultural appropriation bill and \$7,933,096.04 in the current law, or an increase of 202 per cent. Think of it.

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania,



Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and Guam, 33 Northern States and 4 Territorial and insular possessions, received \$13,566,317.96 in the 1914 bill and \$15,205,951.41 in the current law, an increase of only 11 per cent as compared with 202 per cent increase for the 15 Southern States above indicated.

In this connection it will be interesting to note that the 15 Southern States receiving out of the Agricultural appropriation for the current fiscal year an increase of \$4,415,938.08, paid into the Treasury in corporation and individual income tax \$5,987,642.85, while the 33 Northern States and the 4 Territorial and insular possessions, which received an increase of but \$1,639,633.45 in the current law over that of 1914, paid into the Treasury in 1914 in corporation and individual income tax \$54,722,623.67.

The expenditures in the Washington office in 1914, amounting to \$4,555,287.54, were about 24 per cent of the whole appropriation, while the apportioned expenses of the office for 1915, amounting to \$4,931,577.81, were 25 per cent of the total appropriation, and the increase for 1915 over that of 1914 amounts to about 12 per cent.

To say that this is an extravagant overhead charge is to state the case mildly.

I do not assert that the statement made by the Department of Agriculture, and introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina, grouping the expenditures for 1914 and 1915, was intended to make it impossible for anyone to understand the facts, but I do assert that no one, without a very close study of the question could possibly tell from the statement really what was expended and what proportion was expended in the different sections, but I have undertaken that study for the purpose of giving to the House the information which every Member ought to be able to read and understand, without making a technical analysis of the figures and for the purpose of placing before the country the facts.

Of course no one can tell how the appropriations made in the bill now pending will be distributed by the department, but it is fair to assume that the same rule will be applied in the distribution of the funds that characterized the distribution made under the current law, in which event it is obvious that discrimination in favor of one section and against another will be practiced.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take the time of the committee in answering the statement of the gentleman from Illinois. In fact, I have not had an opportunity to analyze these figures myself. I put them into the RECORD just as they were handed to me by officials of the department.

I can say this, and I think it will be confirmed by every member of the Agricultural Committee on this side and on that, that this bill is drawn with no view of giving any section of the country any advantage over any other section of the country.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is true.

Mr. LEVER. I believe that Republican members of the committee will acquiesce in that statement.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me just for a moment?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not charge the committee with any discrimination. I simply charged that the department, in the distribution of the funds, had discriminated.

Mr. LEVER. I think, looking over the summary furnished by the department, that the summary shows that the 15 Southern States, or the South Atlantic States, get about one-third of the total appropriation from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. They get more than half.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman has the figures more clearly in mind than I have, but I think the gentleman, in his analysis, is overlooking the fact that about \$1,500,000 is included of the appropriation under the Weeks law, which has largely in the last few years been going into the Southern States. But taking the real, genuine work of the department, even including the Weeks law, I think the gentleman will find, upon careful study of the figures, that the Southern States get about one-third of the appropriations, or about what they are entitled to; although I do not think either the Committee on Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture, or the House itself ought to be concerned very much as to where these funds are being expended. The question is, Are they being expended where they are needed and where they will do the most service to the entire country?

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he has at hand any comparison of the distribution of this money back in 1910, 1911, or 1912?

Mr. LEVER. The comparison I have is only for 1914 and 1915.

Mr. GOULDEN. I should go back to the department as administered by our friends on the other side and see what was done then.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from New York, and I am glad to say, that ex-Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson was always fair, always generous, and always helpful to the people of the South in the administration of his department.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think that is universally conceded.

Mr. LEVER. I am absolutely glad to stand here and say for him that he has never discriminated against us. In fact, it might be said that, if anything, he was somewhat partial to us, and I thank him for it and I am glad to pay him that tribute.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think that everyone interested in this subject heartily indorses that sentiment.

Mr. LEVER. He was a Republican, but he was a big man, who did not see any North, any South, any West, or any East, but he saw the whole great country and its common interests.

Mr. GOULDEN. That is why I asked the question, because I have the most implicit confidence in Secretary Wilson, and I wanted to know what proportion went to the 15 Southern States under his able administration.

Mr. LEVER. I have not the figures at hand. They are, of course, obtainable.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of ex-Secretary Wilson's administration, that the gentleman's statement is true; and also I have no hesitation in saying, from my knowledge of the matter, that the appropriations are more needed in those States to develop agriculture along certain lines than they are in the North and West.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 20415, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to lay before the House a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a very important message, and I make the point that there is no quorum present.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point, Mr. Speaker.

IMMIGRATION (H. DOC. NO. 1527).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a Nation, would very materially have altered the course and

cooled the humane ardors of our politics. The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land, and who has yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils. The children and the compatriots of these illustrious Americans must stand amazed to see the representatives of their Nation now resolved, in the fullness of our national strength and at the maturity of our great institutions, to risk turning such men back from our shores without test of quality or purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the full effect of this feature of the bill was realized when it was framed and adopted, and it is impossible for me to assent to it in the form in which it is here cast.

The literacy test and the tests and restrictions which accompany it constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation. Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all who were not unfitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life. In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict; for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of character or of personal fitness, but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek, the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 28, 1915.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I shall move a reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed, and that the same be passed, the President's veto notwithstanding. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire any snap judgment on anybody. I think that no one who favors the bill has had any tips as to when the message would come in. I believe that there ought to be a fair discussion of it, and I believe that the message itself within its four corners gives good reasons why the bill should become a law. Therefore I shall ask unanimous consent that on either Thursday or Friday, as may best suit the convenience of gentleman who are opposed to it, the message be taken up for consideration and the consideration of a motion to pass the bill, notwithstanding the veto, and in the meantime that the message lie on the table.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did the gentleman say next Thursday?

The SPEAKER. The time is not a necessary part of the request. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the veto message and bill lie on the Speaker's table temporarily.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that we who are opposed to this legislation are in the same position as the gentleman from Alabama and those who support it. We did not receive any tips, as he states, or any information. We did believe that this great humanitarian President of ours would veto the bill, because we believe that he desires to do what is right and what is just. Therefore I resent the statement that anyone on our side has received any tips as to the possibility of what was likely to be done by the President. Many of us may have had an idea as to our President's intention, but he is not a man who would deliberately give an advantage to one side or the other.

As to the day on which this should be considered I would much prefer, if we could agree to a day, one early next week. I

believe Tuesday would be agreeable to the majority of the Members, because that would give ample opportunity to all, no matter where they reside, to be present. That will give us five or six days. I ask the gentleman from Alabama whether it will be possible to agree on Tuesday of next week?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to disclaim having made any imputation on the gentleman or those opposed to the bill, as the gentleman from Illinois says. I will not even say that the wicked flee when no man pursueth. [Laughter.] It will not be convenient or agreeable to have the message considered before Thursday of next week.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield—while both gentlemen say that they did not receive any tip as to when or whether the President would send a veto message, I think everybody else in the House had received a tip that the President was going to veto the message, and he had to send in a message to-day, to-morrow, or next day, and that is not very far apart. What is the object in postponing the matter for more than a week?

Mr. BURNETT. I frankly state that I think Tuesday would not be ample time.

Mr. MANN. Ample time for what?

Mr. BURNETT. For Members who desire to be here to be present. I could have called it up to-day, I suppose, but I thought it was not fair to do it, and for the same reason, when there may be ample time for Members to be here without any snap judgment being taken, I thought Thursday of next week would be better.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE, Mr. WALLIN, and others objected.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to refer it to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, who made the objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and others.

Mr. MOORE. I made the objection. I think it is unnecessary to wait a week. The gentleman from Alabama asked unanimous consent that it be postponed for a week.

The SPEAKER. That was not a part of the request.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Alabama asked unanimous consent that it be postponed until Thursday, and the Chair put the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not put that part of the request. The gentleman from Alabama did put into his request that it lie on the Speaker's table until next Thursday, but the Chair stated that it was not necessary to put in the date, because it is a privileged matter and the gentleman from Alabama can call it up whenever he gets ready. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is a matter that is privileged. It is within the right of the gentleman from Alabama and his committee to have the message referred to the committee for consideration before reporting it if they desire. It is for the chairman of the committee to determine what time he thinks it is convenient to take the matter up, and I see no reason in the world why an agreement should not be made to let it lie on the table, as it saves time.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman recollect what action the House took when the bill was vetoed by President Taft as to the length of time to be given?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think at that time it was near the end of the session and there was a full attendance of the House. The chairman of the committee thought it advisable to call it up at once. But the only point I am making here is that this is a matter for the chairman of the committee to determine, when he thinks it advisable to bring it before the House, like all other legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Did not the gentleman from Alabama make the motion immediately on receipt of the Taft veto?

Mr. BURNETT. No; not until the next day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He may have, but it must be clear to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, although there may be doubt as to whether there is a two-thirds vote in favor of this bill, there can be no question but that a majority of this House is in favor of the bill, and the gentleman from Alabama can have it referred and bring it back when he pleases, and I think it is wise if we can agree on it satisfactorily to the gentleman and everybody else and let it in the meantime lie on the table.

Mr. MOORE. I am perfectly willing to come to an agreement now, but the gentlemen on the other side seem to have adjusted the matter between themselves, and the chairman of the committee fixed next Thursday and no other day.



Mr. GALLIVAN. I think we can all agree to Thursday next, and I hope all objections will be withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE. Now, many of us would be willing to have a day fixed. I am perfectly willing to have Tuesday fixed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection that a day should be set. I do not desire to delay or desire to hurry or inconvenience any Member of the House. I would prefer that we agree on a day. If we could agree on Tuesday of next week, it will be agreeable, if not I am willing to yield, and if we could set it for Wednesday it would be agreeable to me.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I understand Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday, and that this is privileged business, anyway.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will help clear up this situation a little. This veto and all matters appertaining to it are privileged. The gentleman from Alabama, if it goes to his committee, can call it up in 15 minutes if he wants to do so, or he can call it up on Calendar Wednesday or on Monday, or any time he please; the whole thing is privileged.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker. I suggest to the gentlemen who would prefer to send this matter to the Committee on Immigration, of which I am a member, that they withhold these objections and set a day. I agree with the gentleman who desires to set a day certain, as it will relieve many of the Members of this House from embarrassment. It will make a certain time when gentlemen will all be here and vote upon this all-important matter, and I respectfully suggest to the membership of the House present that we agree upon a day. May I say, in order to come to a conclusion, that we set it for Thursday?

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the Chair restate the situation?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will restate the situation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object, I think, anyhow. As I understand it—and if I am not correct I would like to be informed—if this bill is referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that committee has the power to report the bill with the veto message back at any time and demand immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And they can agree among themselves as to when it shall be called up in the House instead of trying to do so this morning where it is a waste of time, and therefore I object.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. I will withhold the objection for a moment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois withholds his objection for a moment. I desire to call his attention to this fact: If it is referred to the committee, no one knows, of course, but the chairman when the meeting of the committee would be called, and there would be no one but the chairman and members of the committee who would know when the committee is likely to meet and when they would report the bill and when it would come up. I think it would be much better if we could agree on a day now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker. I have absolute confidence in the integrity and honesty of purpose of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]. I have no doubt whatever that he will be perfectly fair with the committee in the matter, and the House can be notified with reference to the time after the gentlemen have agreed upon a day.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I think it will be fairer to every Member of the House here and those who are not here now to have an understanding as to a date, rather than that the committee should report and then get an understanding later on when it will again consume some time, and I think it could be better settled here.

Mr. MANN. I do not see much chance of getting a unanimous-consent agreement, and so I object. Let us go on to other business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the gentleman from Alabama is recognized to make any motion he sees fit.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message of the President be referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Is it in order to move an amendment to a day certain?

The SPEAKER. This is simply a motion to refer, and if it is voted down the gentleman from Alabama can call up the bill right now.

Mr. BURNETT. And in connection with that, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will call the committee together and ask

them to report this bill back on Thursday, and on that motion I move the previous question.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves the previous question on his motion to refer.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on referring the bill and veto message of the President to the Committee on Immigration. The motion was then put, and by vote of the House was agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. SABATH. To ask that 100,000 copies of the President's veto message be printed for distribution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that 100,000 copies of this message be printed.

Mr. HOWARD and Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] notifies the House and the country that on Thursday the committee will report this bill back.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to move that 100,000 copies of the President's message be printed?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matter has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. That has to be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to ask unanimous consent that 50,000 copies of this message be printed for the use of the House.

Mr. HOWARD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] objects.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20415, the Agricultural appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20415) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. And first, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an analysis of the figures prepared and put in the RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. I will take some little time to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting some figures which he names. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. From the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, I have before me a summary of expenditures of that department. The same was published some days ago in the RECORD. From it I quote these figures. For the 15 Southern States—and in these are included Maryland and Delaware—for the year ending June 30, 1914, \$3,579,319.40 was expended in the Southern States, and in the remainder of the States of the Union \$17,145,628.36 was expended. All these figures include the Forest Service and the Weeks law.

Mr. Chairman, in the very nature of things it is impossible to say that so many dollars can be or must be expended in this particular State or in that particular State, or in this particular section or in that section, and the sooner the Members of Congress understand this fact, that all the States of this Union act as one, and that whatever injures one section of the country necessarily injures other sections of the country, and stop this quibbling over sectional propositions in a great bill like this, the better it will be for the country. [Applause.]

I dare say that in the gentleman's home State more money is expended on the meat-inspection proposition in the great city

of Chicago under this bill than in any other given locality in the United States. And yet who objects to it? [Applause.] Problems arise in one section to-day that were not expected yesterday.

Take, for example, the hog-cholera proposition. When that outbreak sprang up and wiped out these great values, Congress did not hesitate to spend \$600,000 in a few of the western hog-growing States of this Union. Take again the case of the foot-and-mouth disease, which sprang up this year. Congress did not hesitate to spend \$2,500,000 to wipe out that disease, because whatever destroys the values in one State of this Union is going to be felt in its effects in the other States of this Union. Again, when the forests of New England were invaded by the gypsy moth, appropriations were at once made available to curb this destructive pest. No man from the South was unpatriotic enough to raise the sectionalism cry when these appropriations were made.

Now, let us take up the question a moment further. You take it in the section of the country where the chief industry is cotton growing. My State produces 4,500,000 bales of cotton. Last year we had nearly 8,000,000 head of cattle to help furnish the meat supply, to say nothing of other millions of dollars from other crops and stock. We probably get less out of this Agricultural bill than any other section in the Union, and yet we are the greatest wealth-producing agricultural State in this Union. When the European war broke out, on the very eve of the time when the cotton, which annually adds a billion dollars to our wealth, came on the market there was no market for it. Who felt it first? We people who produced this great crop in the South, the crop that goes, 65 per cent of it, to foreign countries and brings back the gold supply. Who felt it next? I will tell you. Our people from the South patronize and purchase the manufactured products from the people of the other sections of the country. We go to the West, and we buy your flour. We go to the New England States and buy your manufactured products. We go to other sections to buy iron and steel to build our bridges across our streams and to erect our skyscrapers. We purchase from the manufacturers of our northern and eastern brethren farm implements, tools, wagons, and harness. We take the money made from the cotton and we purchase your finished products.

I want to ask you, when this market for cotton fell down, what happened in the Southern States? The first thing to happen was that expense accounts had to be cut down in those States for people to live. Our merchants had already put in their orders for the next year's supply, and they canceled those orders for dry goods and hardware and everything that could be done without, so that while the direct injury was felt first by the South, every other section of the country felt the kick-back of that injury and loss sustained by reason of the failure in the price of the great staple crop of the South.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague [Mr. YOUNG of Texas] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think this side ought to have as much time as you have consumed on that side.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] had 13 minutes and I had less than 5. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] will have 10, and that will leave 5 over there. If you want to make it 10, all right.

Mr. MANN. Do you want 10 minutes to continue this sectional discussion?

Mr. LEVER. I understand the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] wants to make a statement along this line. He is a member of the committee, and one of the best ones on it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from South Carolina wants to open a discussion that will probably last all afternoon. If he wants 15 minutes on one side, then I suggest an equal time on the other side.

Mr. LEVER. No; the gentleman misunderstood my request. I was asking unanimous consent that the discussion on this paragraph be closed in 10 minutes. That would give the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] five minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] five minutes.

Mr. MANN. They are both on the same side.

Mr. LEVER. No; I think the gentleman from Minnesota is on the other side of the question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] that the statement that I made was simply an analytical study of the figures placed in the Record by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. If those figures had not been placed there, I would not have made the study; but the figures speak for themselves, and what I said is deduced entirely from what the gentleman said and from those figures.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, is there any objection to my request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not put the request, as he thought gentlemen were going to agree. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, when these great problems confront the agricultural interests of the country, it is for this country to deal with those problems. If the foot-and-mouth disease breaks out in any part of the country, we want to deal with it and suppress it, and it makes no difference in what section of the country it springs up. Let any other problem threaten a great crop of the country, it is the duty of the Government to intervene and meet that problem, because this is one country, and one section can not be injuriously affected without that effect being felt in every other section of the country. In the very nature of things some sections of this country are given specifically to agriculture. Other sections of the country are given specifically to manufacturing and mining and other industries, great in themselves, yet in those sections of the country, under the very conditions that surround them, agricultural problems do not arise as they arise in the great agricultural belt of the country. And what I appeal for is that we ought to remember that this is one country, one flag, and one interest, and no man wants to be guilty of trying to destroy a great bill or an appropriation, it matters not in what section problems are being dealt with, when that appropriation is wisely expended for the purpose of improving agricultural conditions, because those conditions need to be improved, and this committee is free from partisanship and free from sectionalism. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this discussion, and would not do so were it not for the fact that the statement placed in the Record by the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, and prepared by the Department of Agriculture, is, in my opinion, absolutely misleading and unfair. I do not mean by that to claim that the figures are erroneous, but I do mean to claim that if that statement purports to show that one section of the country has not received a larger proportion of the local benefits of the appropriations in the Agricultural bill than another portion of the country, then the statement is absolutely misleading in that respect.

The Department of Agriculture expends annually about \$25,000,000. According to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for last year, \$16,000,000 of that amount is spent in regulatory services. No one would claim for a minute that that \$16,000,000 ought to be taken into consideration in a statement which purports to show that one section is not receiving greater local benefits from the appropriations than another. For instance, the Bureau of Animal Industry spends some \$3,000,000 a year in meat inspection. Probably 90 per cent of that money is spent in half a dozen cities in the United States, and yet no one with a modicum of fairness could claim that those particular cities or the States in which they are located ought to be charged with local benefits under that appropriation.

Six hundred thousand dollars are spent annually in animal quarantines. No one would claim that that appropriation ought to be charged to any particular section. We spend some \$635,000 a year for the enforcement of the food and drug act. No one ought to claim that that amount should be taken into consideration in determining the local benefits of this appropriation bill. Yet that is exactly what the Department of Agriculture has done in making up this statement.

Now, there are some items in this bill the benefits of which are purely local and recognized as being local. Among these are the items for farm-demonstration work in the North and for cotton boll-weevil work in the South. Of those items the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], who preceded me, says his State probably receives less than any other. Yet the record shows that the State of Texas received last year \$72,000 for farm-demonstration work, while the State of Iowa, very nearly as



large, if not larger, in its agricultural products, received but \$17,000.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. Is it not true that there is \$400,000 appropriated in this bill for farm-demonstration work in the North?

Mr. ANDERSON. And that \$400,000 is distributed among 33 States, while the \$666,000 appropriated for the cotton boll-weevil work and farm-demonstration work in the South is spent in 15 States. I do not complain particularly about that. Everybody who knows anything about the agriculture of the United States knows that the South needs help worse than any other section of the country. The thing I am complaining about is that the Department of Agriculture has presented a statement here which is absolutely misleading as to the facts, if it pretends to show, as I think it does, that these 15 Southern States have not received greater local benefits from the Agricultural bill than the rest of the country.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman will concede that any benefit derived from this money spent in any part of the country will be for the benefit of the whole country.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, no; I think not. I do not think the gentleman's statement is entirely accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, \$18,750.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, we have just passed an item relating to telephone and telegraph charges, and I take occasion to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether he was able to get those figures that we asked for the other day with respect to the division of the appropriation for general telegraph and telephone charges.

Mr. LEVER. I asked for the information requested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the colloquy between him and myself. I believe the proposition the gentleman had in mind was, if a corporation or an individual telegraphed to the department for information, could that information be telegraphed back at Government rates and paid for by the Government?

Mr. MOORE. The question was whether they could get it free of charge.

Mr. LEVER. They do not get it free of charge. I put that information in the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. Was it put in the RECORD as of the day's proceedings?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF CROP ESTIMATES.

Salaries, Bureau of Crop Estimates: One statistician, who shall be chief of bureau, \$4,000; 1 chief clerk, \$1,800; 6 clerks, class 4; 9 clerks, class 3; 14 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 19 clerks, class 1; 17 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 21 clerks, at \$900 each; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 2 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$480; 1 charwoman, messenger, or laborer, \$540; 2 charwomen, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$360 each; in all, \$116,750.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask a question about this bureau. Does the gentleman from South Carolina think this information that the people of this country derive from the Crop Estimate Bureau is worth what it costs?

Mr. LEVER. I do. I regard the Bureau of Crop Estimates as one of the most valuable lines of work conducted by the department. The estimates and statistics that they furnish are almost invaluable to the farmers of the country.

Mr. BOOHER. How are they valuable to the farmer?

Mr. LEVER. Let me illustrate very briefly: The Department of Agriculture collects statistics—estimates—as to the total yield of the cotton in this country. It gathers those statistics as to the condition of the cotton crop from time to time. On the first Monday of December, I think it is, it publishes a final estimate as to the yield of cotton. That estimate, coupled with the information issued by the Census Bureau every two weeks, furnishes the farmer the only accurate, unbiased data of the probable yield of that crop for the year that he can have.

Before this system was adopted the speculators of the country—large cotton firms—would issue their own private estimates—and they do now—with the effect that it kept the market in a turmoil and kept the farmer in absolute darkness as to the actual situation. Since, however, we have begun to carry on this system of estimates—while the individual estimates go out to the country; to the whole speculative world—the farmers themselves, in my part of the country at least, look to the accurate information issued by the Census Bureau and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. And is it not a fact that the estimates made by the Government as to the cotton crops have been approximately correct?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I will say that there was an investigation of the matter made four or five years ago and a period of 10 years was taken to ascertain how accurate these figures were. It was found that in one five-year period they overestimated the crop very slightly, and within the other five years they slightly underestimated it, but the average was only about 2 per cent out of the way for 10 years. The farmers appreciate the service and want it continued, although a great many farmers misunderstand it.

Mr. BOOHER. My observation of the bureau is about this: When the crop has been planted three to six weeks they begin to issue bulletins as to the probable production of that crop, and they keep it up during the entire season. At first they report that it is going to make 99 per cent of a full crop. The result of that is that the grain speculators put down the price of grain. Then they make an estimate that there will be 80 per cent full crop, and the price goes up and the speculator gets the benefit of it because he has got the crop. And then perhaps it will be 75 per cent of a full crop. Whenever a report of that kind goes out there can be but one result, and that is that it acts injuriously on the producer of the crop. It may be true that the cotton estimates are different from those of wheat, but you take it in the great wheat and corn raising sections of this country, and the different reports go out affecting the prices of the commodity injuriously to the producer.

Mr. BALTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. BALTZ. I noticed last year that the State report of Illinois estimated the crop of wheat at 20,000,000 bushels, while the Federal report was 53,000,000; that was on last year's crop.

Mr. BOOHER. I read in the hearings that they made their investigations very carefully and tried to be accurate, but they go to the great transportation companies—in other words, the railroads and the warehouses—and they take their estimates and compare them with their own, and upon these estimates they mainly base their reports; but the information comes mainly from the railroads and the warehouses.

The time of Mr. BOOHER having expired, by unanimous consent he was given five minutes more.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, I have talked with a great many farmers about this matter—or rather they have talked with me—and I have not had a farmer talk with me but who was opposed to these crop estimates. It may be that the farmer does not understand it, it may be that I have not been able to explain it thoroughly to him; but the farmers as a general thing do not rely on this information, and they do not believe that it is worth the money that it costs the Government.

Mr. JACOWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. JACOWAY. Suppose the Government got out no estimates at all, would not that leave the farmers at the mercy of the speculators to bear down on the price of the commodity?

Mr. BOOHER. No; I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this country for 110 years never had any crop estimates, and the farmers got along very well; and we did not hear of anybody being crushed.

Mr. JACOWAY. Was not the Government different then from what it is now?

Mr. BOOHER. Wonderfully different; we did not have much paternalism in the country at that time; and now we have more paternalism and less individualism.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes.

Mr. CULLOP. Do not the large dealers send men out into the country, into the field to make estimates, and do not they send out competent men to make investigation as to the production?

Mr. BOOHER. There is no doubt about that; and if the gentleman will read the hearings before the committee, he will see that Mr. Easterbrook says that they rely a good deal on information gathered by the very class of people that the gentleman mentions. You can pick up any agricultural paper in the country and it publishes the estimates of the very men the gentleman suggests, and the farmers get the advantage of it.

Mr. CULLOP. Is it not true that the crop report of the Government is usually taken by some man of the city who drives out along the road and looks over the fields and then sends in his estimate?

Mr. BOOHER. I do not know about that.

Mr. CULLOP. That is true in my section of the country.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. That is not true in our section of the country.

Mr. CULLOP. In my State our farmers rely on the reports made by the large dealers who send out competent men who go into the fields and make their estimates. They rely upon those estimates more than they do upon the Government report.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say in response to what the gentleman from Indiana says, that in our section these crop estimates are made as a rule by practical farmers. They visit the farm and make estimates. I desire to make the further suggestion that it was the condition suggested by the gentleman from Indiana that private parties engaged in various kinds of business sent out agents and made investigations and made reports in their own interest that required the legislation to be adopted which is in this bill, providing that the Government should make the estimates and make reports in order to meet the reports which private parties were making, which were not in the interest of the producers, but in their own interest and in the interest of the people who wanted to buy the products.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOOHER. I have but a moment or so remaining.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will ask for some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for two minutes, and I will yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, now I do not know, of course, the way these appointments are made except from the hearings, but the department I assume uses the best means it can. I assume that the department tries to be just as accurate in it as it can be; there is no question about that in mind, but the question with me and with the farmers with whom I have talked about this is whether or not this information is worth the cost of obtaining it. The farmers with whom I have talked say it is not, that when they report a full crop or that there will be a 95 per cent crop of corn or wheat that the price of wheat goes down, which was an injury to them if they have got any of the old crop on hand. Now, in a few weeks or a month they issue another bulletin that the size of the crop is not going to be more than 80 per cent. Then what is the result? The grain in the hands of speculators goes up and the farmer, the producer of the wheat or corn or oats or other cereal, is caught in the trap going either way. If he backs up they get him, and if he goes ahead they get him. Now, if it is worth the money that the chairman of the committee seems to think it is the appropriation ought to be made, but it does seem to me there ought to be a careful investigation of this question by this Committee on Agriculture to see whether or not this section of this bill can not be cut down, and cut down very materially, and if it is not worth to the producers of this country what it is costing it ought not to be made.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have crop estimates at all, it is very essential that they be made by the Government. If you withdraw this work of estimates from the Government, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests, you put it entirely in the hands of the speculators to make them, and I do not care how fair gentlemen here think they will be in those estimates to the producers, I had rather trust Government officials, who are sworn to do their duty, to do the just thing by the farmers of the country than to turn this work over to the men who are figuring on ways and means to buy the crop as cheaply as possible. Various concerns representing those who speculated in cotton and grain used to be the only source of this information. They gathered such information as they desired, and published such crop estimates as helped their business, and by this method of crop estimation they robbed the producer every year of millions of money. [Applause.] It is this that caused the friends of the producer to see the necessity of having estimates made by the Government. Now, if we do not have estimates at all, it is all right; the Government need not make them; but the very moment you withdraw this work by the Government the speculators will fleece the corn producer, the wheat producer, and the cotton producer. These estimates are not made now by information gathered about

towns and cities. My information is that these representatives of the Government are in every precinct in the farming sections of this country. I helped to increase the number and this committee had to do with swelling this number of crop reporters for the Government.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a bad step for us to take, for as long as estimates can be made by somebody, speculators will make them, and then in the absence of reports or estimates by the Government, which will try to speak the truth in regard to crop estimates. The farmer would be left to the mercy of speculators to make and publish whatever estimates suited them. Why not? Here is a man who wants to buy a certain crop. He proposes an estimate on that crop. Is he going to publish an estimate that will injure his business and put up the price of the very thing that he wants to buy cheaply? Of course not. [Applause.] Then, if he works to his own interest it is necessary that the Government shall come in and make a true estimate as to what the crop will be. Now, Mr. Chairman, I admit that time was when this information on which these estimates were made by the Government was not as full as it is now, but the information now gathered by the Department of Agriculture comes in, not from a handful of reporters, but from hundreds and thousands of reporters in the various farming portions of the Government.

Mr. BOOHER. Where does the gentleman get his information that the Government has got these skilled men in every community in this country?

Mr. HEFLIN. I furnished a list of over 1,000 names from my district four or five years ago, and I recall that Members of this House were called upon to furnish the names of men who would report in the various sections and precincts of the country.

Mr. BOOHER. You can not find anything of that kind in these hearings. I call the gentleman's attention to the hearings and ask him to read them, and I think then he will qualify his statement.

Mr. HEFLIN. No; not in these hearings. I am not referring to the hearings on this bill, but about what happened four or five years ago. I suppose the chairman of this committee remembers when we were called upon by the department to supply the names of those who would do this work—

Mr. LEVER. Yes—

Mr. HEFLIN. Giving reports as to the condition of the crop in the growing season. I have supplied names myself from my district, and I am certain they did not single out my district and neglect the other districts in the United States. It can not be, I am sure, that my district was of so much more importance in an agricultural way than the district of my good friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER].

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman permit me to read just a question and answer from the hearings, showing where they get this information?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I read:

Mr. MAGUIRE. I would like to inquire whether you have made a comparison to see how your forecasts agree with such as Mr. HELGESSEN suggests—the railroad estimates? A great many railroads and other agencies make forecasts.

Mr. ESTABROOK. We watch those very closely and make comparisons from time to time. We consider them as one source of information.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Do you think your agents all over the country are influenced one way or the other by the reports that they see of some railroad systems or the forecasts of some agency?

Mr. ESTABROOK. No; I think not. It is their business to check those up. That is what they are out in the field for. They interview all these people, see those elevator men and railroad men, keep in touch with them, and get their estimates, and then check them up from their own private sources of information. If it were at all necessary, we could disprove many of those estimates.

Now, you take what the railroads gather up and what the warehouses gather up, and that is the whole thing on which you base the estimate.

Mr. LEVER. Will my friend yield to me for a word?

Mr. HEFLIN. They interrogate every witness available, I understand, and consult every reliable source of information possible in their effort to make the estimate speak as nearly as possible the truth.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is right. That is what I myself was going to say.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest to the gentleman to wait until the next paragraph. The time on this paragraph is up.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.



The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Bureau of Crop Estimates: For all necessary expenses for collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, and interpreting data relating to agriculture; for making and publishing periodically crop and live-stock estimates, including acreage, yield, and value of farm products, as follows.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have spent all my life in proximity to the cotton fields. All my life I have been interested in the field of the cotton fields. I have had ups and downs as a grower, with more downs than ups, and in the last year, particularly, a disastrous experience as a cotton grower. I have had a good many years of experience as a cotton dealer and as an exporter of cotton. I want to say of my knowledge—not speaking from prejudice, but of my knowledge—that the effort of every business house with which I have ever had any acquaintance that has ever put out a forecast of the yield of cotton has been to make it accurate.

Why should they not be accurate? Successful business is not conducted upon a lack of information. Men of repute and integrity—and there are such in all branches of business—do not want to acquire a reputation of spreading misinformation abroad. This House seems to be full of gentlemen who believe that because a man is in business he is necessarily dishonest and untruthful; who believe that there is only one side to a speculative market.

Now, business men just as often go in on the bull side of cotton, to make a profit out of an advance, as they go in on the bear side, to make a profit out of a decline; and in the South they very much more often go in on the bull side.

Now, I recall in my experience one house, a great English firm in London, strange to say, and not in Liverpool, which has been marvelously accurate for more than 30 years in its estimates. A member of that firm whom I know personally very well, a man of high character and a reputable and an honorable and a truthful man, traveled in every State in the South in the months of July, August, and September, beginning his journeys in the Gulf States and working up with the development of the cotton crop; and on information supplied by him this house annually put out a forecast which was marvelously accurate.

On the other hand, before they began taking the figures respecting the output at the gins, and which necessarily, as the yield of cotton increased normally year after year, showed in the reports an increased production almost each year, when the Government was issuing annual estimates, those estimates were marvelous for their inaccuracy. I remember on one occasion going down to the Department of Agriculture the day after an estimate was made and seeing the man there in charge of that bureau. I do not remember the figures that were given out in that estimate, but I will use arbitrary ones for the purpose of illustration. An estimate, say, was put out that the crop would be 9,100,000 bales. I went to that man and I said to him: "Good heavens, how can you issue such a report as that, when the receipts that are already in show more than that amount?" He said: "Mr. SLAYDEN, I know it is absurd and inaccurate, but we can not reach any other conclusion on the data which are provided to us."

Mr. LEVER. How long ago was that?

Mr. SLAYDEN. That was some years ago. I observed it for 20 years in succession, Mr. Chairman, and the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were almost uniformly inaccurate.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not get up here to state that. I got up here to resent the imputation that men of business, speculators, even, can not be honest and truthful men. The country seems to have gone mad on the theory that because a man does not toil with his hands in the field he is necessarily trying to rob somebody.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman of what particular value to the producer of the growing crop it would be to underestimate that crop unless he is holding over some of last year's crop that he wants to sell?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I did not understand the gentleman. Does the gentleman mean the crop grown in 1914, now being marketed?

Mr. MARTIN. No. I mean what particular value is the estimate of the crop of 1915 to a man who is growing that crop unless he has some of the crop of 1914 lying over?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It would be of particular value to the buyer if he estimates an excessive yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. But it would be of no value to the producer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers, and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, \$17,500: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange books and periodicals of the Library not needed for permanent use for other books and periodicals.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Here we have an item providing for the purchase of books and materials connected with the library of the Department of Agriculture. In this paragraph we find an item for official traveling expenses. It is very hard for me to understand—though, perhaps, the gentleman can give the information—how a library can have any traveling expenses.

Mr. LEVER. I answered that question last year in the consideration of this bill, and I will state my recollection of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not recall that the gentleman had done so. If I had recalled it I would not have asked the question.

Mr. LEVER. Occasionally the librarian of the Agricultural Department desires to attend some convention of librarians, and the traveling expenses are allowed him for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman has not remembered all that he said last year.

Mr. LEVER. I do not recall all that I said.

Mr. MANN. Occasionally the librarian of the Agricultural Department is required to attend a sale of books, or to inspect books which are very rare, which are for sale, and which are very much desired by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Illinois for supplementing my statement.

Mr. MANN. I think the expense is very nominal, but occasionally it is required.

A MEMBER. Not over \$200 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand the need of having some small amount for that character of expense. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. REED having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bill of the following title:

S. 6839. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES.

Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings, grounds, and heating apparatus; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for,

and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, \$115,000, of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in line 18, on page 59. It is evidently a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of the above acts and the act approved May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," relative to their administration, including the employment of clerks, assistants, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, freight and express charges, official traveling expenses, office fixtures, supplies, apparatus, telegraph and telephone service, gas, electric current, and rent outside of the District of Columbia, \$59,500; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe the form of the annual financial statement required under the above acts, ascertain whether the expenditures are in accordance with their provisions, coordinate the work of the Department of Agriculture with that of the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations in the lines authorized in said acts, and make report thereon to Congress: *Provided*, That of this amount \$20,100 may be used for general administrative expenses connected with the lines of work of the States relations service, including the offices of the director, the chief clerk, the officers in charge of publications, library, accounts, records, supplies, and property, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto: *And provided further*, That hereafter all correspondence, bulletins, and reports for the furtherance of the purposes of the act approved May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and the act supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," may be transmitted in the mails of the United States free of charge for postage under such regulations as the Postmaster General from time to time may prescribe by such college officer or other person connected with the extension department of such college as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate to the Postmaster General.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the last proviso in the paragraph as being new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. To what part of the paragraph does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. From line 10 to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstration work outside of the cotton belt, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$386,080.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 63, in line 2, by striking out "\$386,080" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$289,560."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed reduces the item for farm-demonstration work in the Northern States by 25 per cent. If this amendment is adopted I intend to move to reduce the amount for farm-demonstration work in the South proportionately.

This morning there was carried in the Washington Post a story regarding the present financial condition of the country. That story states that there will be a deficit in the Treasury of about \$90,000,000 at the end of the present fiscal year, and that there is now a deficit of about \$70,000,000, notwithstanding the war tax and the income tax; that in the near future we will probably be under the necessity either of finding new subjects of taxation or of issuing bonds. It emphasizes the necessity of exercising the most rigid economy.

I am in favor of the extension of agricultural education. I am particularly in favor of it in the way of demonstration work. But under the Lever Act, if the States take advantage of all its provisions, we will expend this year \$1,080,000 more than has been expended for this purpose in any previous year with the exception of last year, when we spent \$480,000 more than the preceding year. In view of the constantly increasing appropriations contemplated under the Lever Act and the condition of the Treasury I think the Congress ought to cut down the appropriations under these items, both the one to which this amendment applies and the succeeding one, until those items shall represent only investigational work and overhead charge on the part of the United States Government. The time has now come when the demonstration work in agricultural lines ought to be carried on practically exclusively by the agricultural colleges and other State institutions and the investigational work carried on by the Federal Government. In other words, the activities of the Federal Government ought to be

limited very largely to the investigational lines, while the State work ought to be confined to the dissemination of the information gathered by the investigational work of the Federal Government. With that end in view, I have proposed this very modest reduction of the two amounts involved in this bill going to farm-demonstration work.

Mr. BARTLETT. Until last year this work was done in cooperation with other people, who also furnished funds for the purpose, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. The work under the next item was, and under both, I think.

Mr. BARTLETT. Under both.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then in the last appropriation bill an amendment was put on in the Senate, and the House agreed to the amendment, prohibiting the department from using any money contributed by anyone else, did it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. It prohibited the department from accepting certain kinds of contributions. Of course, the States were not prohibited from contributing.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; but Congress, by the adoption of this Senate amendment, prohibited the Secretary of Agriculture from accepting contributions from outside to the fund over which Mr. Knapp exercises control.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; from private persons or corporations, and the amount of the appropriation was increased by reason of that fact.

Mr. BARTLETT. It was doubled, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does not the gentleman think the prohibition contained in that Senate amendment last year ought to be repealed?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think both these amounts ought to be reduced.

Mr. BARTLETT. You could reduce the amount if you restored the old law, could you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. In other words, under the old law it was just half of what it is now.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is mistaken. We have no assurance that the old cooperative arrangement would be restored.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it ought to be restored.

Mr. LEVER. Neither do I.

Mr. HAUGEN. We had no assurance, but we passed the Lever Act, which provided for the appropriation of \$480,000 permanent appropriation, which adds that amount to this appropriation. Besides, we have other appropriations available, providing the States accept and put up an equal amount, which in the aggregate will amount to \$1,080,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question about that proposition, and the chairman of the committee stated, when the Lever bill was under consideration, that he thought the policy would be to reduce these two items as fast as the appropriations became available under the Lever Act. The work done under these appropriations should be limited very largely to investigational work with the view to furnishing information which the demonstrations under the Lever Act were to carry to the people. The only purpose of my amendment is to commit Congress now to the policy of reducing these two items as funds under the Lever Act become available. As I said in the first place, for the next fiscal year more than a million dollars will be available under the Lever Act, and we certainly can properly at this time make a reduction in these two items.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman makes the statement that for the next fiscal year the fund available under the Lever Act will be about a million dollars. The gentleman makes the statement on the assumption that the States are going to accept the provisions of the Lever Act, many of which have not so far done so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understood that all the States had accepted the terms of the Lever Act. I do not mean to say that all the States have made appropriations which will entitle them to a portion of the fund appropriated under the Lever Act, but what I do mean to say is that if the States do make the appropriations, as they are expected to, more than a million dollars will be available under the Lever Act. I think it is better that the appropriations should be made under the Lever Act than under this item, because the contributions by the States are compulsory, and they are not compulsory under these two items. That adds another reason why the appropriations should be carried as far as possible under the Lever Act and not under these two items.



Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Under this provision they require cooperation of the States, and they will not give them any money unless they contribute.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true; but the item does not require a contribution.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The department does.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is true the department requires a certain contribution from the States, but it has not been uniform. In some cases it has been equal to the contribution of the Federal Government and in many instances it has been less, while under the Lever Act the contributions in every case must be uniform. Every State is then treated exactly alike. If the appropriations for farm demonstration work are based on the Lever Act, we will get away from the sectional proposition that we have been talking about this morning, and the appropriations will be fairly distributed over the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The motion of the gentleman from Minnesota is pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I can move to amend his amendment, can I not? When the Lever Extension Act was brought before this House for a final vote last September, as I recall, I protested against the policy under which the National Government was committing itself of appropriating millions and millions of dollars for work belonging exclusively to the State, in that instance amounting in 10 years, as I recollect, to the enormous sum of \$4,500,000. Here we are reaping in this demonstration work the whirlwind of the practice in having the National Government assume State functions. The proponents of that measure in advocacy of it stated that these appropriations would be eliminated, and yet we find the department, admitting that although the work is the same, coming and asking that these appropriations in this bill shall be continued. If there is anything that emphasizes the extravagance of the department and the disinclination of the department that has a hobby to check expenditures, it is this very item under consideration.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield. I do not think the amendment goes far enough, and I would like to see the whole appropriation eliminated. Here we have an appropriation of \$300,000 for cooperation in demonstration work. The hearings disclose that the work is identical with the work provided for under the Lever bill. What justification can anybody in these hard-pressed times, when a bond issue is imminent and when a deficit stares us in the face and when this bill is under consideration which carries the largest appropriation that it has ever carried in the history of the Government, have for the continuation of these large appropriations.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I want to suggest to the gentleman that there was an amendment offered to the Lever bill on the floor of the House which provided that nothing in that bill should interfere with these appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, but the hearings disclose that the work is identical under these appropriations as in the Lever bill. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are to be expended under this extravagant appropriation of the Government's money.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman mean to say that we are, in effect, appropriating money twice for the same purpose?

Mr. STAFFORD. We are appropriating for identically the same thing under the items in this paragraph and the work as authorized in the Lever Act.

Mr. MOORE. In an address made by the gentleman on yesterday he referred to "pork" in the river and harbor appropriation bill. Does the gentleman mean to say that same condition might apply to the agricultural bill in connection with any of these items?

Mr. STAFFORD. What condition?

Mr. MOORE. Why, the gentleman yesterday referred to "pork" in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is acknowledged by everybody. As far as the intercoastal waterways project is concerned, everybody, except, perhaps, the president of the Inland Waterways Association—everybody else who is not prejudiced or biased or interested in this subject—knows it is a chimerical proposition. But I decline to go off on that proposition.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is way off now.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is extravagance. Here we have an instance where the department is not willing to accept hundreds of thousands of dollars appropriated in a permanent act, but comes here again asking for a continuation of the same old appropriations, so as to increase the agents in this field of work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman from Michigan opposing this section?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I am opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I am in favor of the bill as it stands.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will not ask for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], although we admit that some of the statements made by him and by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] are correct. It is true that the work to be done under this appropriation and the appropriation carried in the following paragraph are the same, to some extent, as the work contemplated in the Lever Act. Some one has said it was the Lever-Smith Act, but it is the Lever Act. [Applause.] A gentleman in another body tried to take advantage of the popularity of this act to attach his name to it, but the credit for this law belongs to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and to him alone. [Applause.]

The Lever Act provides money for extension work in cooperation with agricultural colleges of the country; the first year \$480,000, \$10,000 for each State, to be given to each State unconditionally. It provides for an additional appropriation of \$600,000 each year for seven years, when the law will mature, when it will carry annually the sum of \$4,580,000. Most of that money, though, is to be appropriated by the Federal Government and paid to the States on condition that the States shall duplicate the amount which they might respectively be entitled to receive under the law. And it was intended by the committee which framed the law that that money should be used largely to carry on the same kind of work that is now being carried on under these two appropriations—money to be appropriated under this paragraph for farm demonstration work in the States outside of the cotton belt and the money appropriated in the next paragraph for helping the States of the South to overcome the evils and the effects of the boll weevil. Now that line of work is entirely in its infancy. It has practically just begun, and these sums of money appropriated for it in the different sections of the bill are, I was about to say, a mere drop in the bucket compared to the money actually necessary to carry on the work. These sums appropriated by this bill are altogether much lower than is necessary properly to carry on the work.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield right there for a moment?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I think the figures will show this work has been carried on in two hundred and some odd counties, whereas there are 1,600 counties without it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I do not remember those figures, but I know whenever application is made for some of this money the Department of Agriculture has found it necessary to deny the request; they have not the money, because the appropriations have not been large enough.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman does not think the appropriation is large enough and that this work is not carried on fast enough, why does he not move to increase the appropriation?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The work is increasing very rapidly, and the money provided by the Lever law is at present small, but each year it will be larger, each year following it will be larger, until it will total the sum of \$4,580,000. The idea in continuing the appropriation provided in this bill is that that work be carried on and the maturity of the Lever bill be anticipated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$688,020: Pro-

vided. That the expense of such service shall be defrayed from this appropriation and such cooperative funds as may be voluntarily contributed by State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers, and individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 63, line 7, strike out "\$666,020" and insert "\$499,515."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely offer this amendment as a matter of good faith with myself. I stated that I would offer it as I had offered the amendment to cut down the preceding item. As a matter of fact this item ought to be cut down a great deal more than the amendment provides. The statement submitted by the Department of Agriculture to the committee shows that this \$666,000 is divided among 15 Southern States at an average of about \$44,000 each, and that the preceding item of \$386,000 is divided among 33 States at an average of about \$12,000 a year each. I merely moved to cut it down 25 per cent in the hope that our southern friends would recognize the equity in making that small reduction.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, personally I believe that if there is any money that the Government spends that is of more value than any other money it spends, it is the money that we spend in aiding the farmer by practical demonstrations and theoretical demonstrations which add to the value and the amount of the crops produced. [Applause.]

I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman. The amount carried in the bill now is between \$600,000 and \$700,000—a very great increase over what it was a few years ago—and it is further supplemented by the amount carried in the Lever bill. The Lever bill adds half a million dollars a year for a number of years to the amount of the permanent appropriation until that amount will be over \$4,500,000, I believe. That will be 10 years from now, and by that time it is very likely that you will be carrying a larger amount for this appropriation, because I doubt very much whether the appropriations in these two items will be discontinued or even reduced.

There is no doubt but that the country, through the theoretical and practical work of the Department of Agriculture, and the teaching and the urging which they have done, has considerably increased the productivity of the soil. Yet we have only commenced on that subject. In the little farms of Europe, of course, there is an advantage there. They produce a much greater amount of wheat and other cereals and other crops per acre, with the same amount of cultivation, than we do. It is true that with our large areas and farms we must not expect to produce quite so much, and yet everyone knows that in the midst of a time when the cost of living is increasing and the population and consumption are increasing more rapidly than the amount of crops produced from the soil—in the midst of all that we could very largely increase the quantities per acre and the number of acres by more careful attention and cultivation.

Now, having said that, I would like to say a word to my southern friends. The amount in this item is \$666,020. That is for farm demonstrations exclusively in the South. The other item was for \$386,000, for farm demonstrations in the North. I make no complaint whatever about that. I think you need this demonstration work under present conditions in the South to a greater extent than it is needed in the North. But when we freely give it to you, so far as the North is concerned, sometimes I wonder at the nerve of some gentlemen from the South who, whenever a proposition comes up affecting the industries of the North, proceed to get red in the face and inveigh against these industries in the North. We are willing to help you in the South.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois would say that about any member of the Committee on Agriculture, however.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not say that about the chairman of the committee, nor, so far as I recall, have I said it about any member of the Committee on Agriculture, although I do not think that any of the gentlemen from down there are practically interested in taking care of our industries in the North, outside of our agricultural products, and they have been very fair about those, I believe. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] a little while ago said was true, that wherever you help one part of the country you help the whole country, and where you injure one part of the country you injure the whole country. We ask just the same attention from you about our matters that you receive from us. I constantly hear Members on the other side of the House, and sometimes members of the Committee on Agriculture, assaulting as violently as they know how some of the

industries of my city, without which your farmers would be in very much worse shape than they are now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN and Mr. LEVER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, will be recognized first.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up any of the time of the committee, but I think it is fair to the committee to say that the farm demonstration work in the North has been begun only within the last three years and since the party to which I belong has been in the majority in this House. Before that time not a dollar of money for this purpose was being expended except in the South. That is a strange coincidence—that the Republican Party should have started the farm demonstration work in the South and that the Democratic Party should have started the farm demonstration work in the North, and it shows how nonpartisan and nonsectional and how generous to each other the members of the Committee on Agriculture are. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman explain to the House how this money is expended; in what way it is distributed in carrying out the purpose of the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that that is rather a long story, but I can do it in a few moments, I think.

Mr. MOORE. I can come in a little later.

Mr. LEVER. No; I prefer to answer the question now. In most of the States there is a cooperative arrangement with the State agricultural college in the expenditure of this sum. The State agricultural college is located at some central point in the State, and in this college is what we know as the extension leader. This extension leader has his various local demonstrators in the various communities of the State, who come in personal contact with the farmers of the community and impart to them the information in regard to better methods of agriculture.

Mr. MOORE. The paragraph provides for the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere. Does that mean labor in the sense of mere manual labor or is it scientific labor or brain labor?

Mr. LEVER. I really do not know what construction they give to the term "labor" there, but that item provides for the overhead charges in the city of Washington.

Mr. MOORE. The item says:

For farmers' cooperative demonstrations and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$66,020.

I am asking the question because that is a very large sum of money, and if it is applied to the employment of labor, that is one thing. If it is applied to the appointments of scientists and experts, that is another thing. That is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman this: That under that language probably this item will provide for the charwomen or a messenger and probably occasionally a laborer, but the bulk of the administrative expenses in the city of Washington would be such as the gentleman describes as scientific work.

Mr. MOORE. Are bodies of workmen sent out to do this work, or is it a body of scientific and brain workers?

Mr. LEVER. These men sometimes travel and meet large bodies of farmers in conventions. They sometimes meet a convention of the various county agents and impart to them the instructions that they carry from the city of Washington, but the bulk of this work is done in the field.

Mr. GOULDEN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has anticipated one of my questions, but I want to ask if the chairman of the committee has any idea of how much of the amount included in these two items is for the employment of labor in the city of Washington, including all overhead charges—about what percentage of these two appropriations?

Mr. LEVER. I will say that I can not give the exact figures off hand. Here are the items submitted in the estimates, but I have not added them up. It is, however, a comparatively small amount, about the usual amount for administrative purposes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am somewhat familiar with the demonstration work in the North in this direction, and I want to compliment the committee and the department for the progress that they are making. If the chairman of this committee [Mr. LEVER] had done nothing else than to secure the passage of the Lever Act, his name would be handed down to posterity, and



as a benefactor would be remembered by the farmers of this country for many years. [Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Is there anything in the hearings about what progress is being made toward the destruction of the boll weevil?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the purposes of these two items, and the general progress being made under the two items, were quite well known to the members of the committee, and hence we did not take the time of the committee to take testimony upon the subject, so that the hearings this year were not very full.

Mr. BOOHER. What new method have they discovered, or what new remedy have they discovered, for this scourge in the cotton district?

Mr. LEVER. They have not discovered any new remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. The only practicable way that has been found of handling the boll-weevil situation is to grow a crop of cotton under certain cultural methods in spite of the boll weevil. In my judgment, so far as the entomological work in reference to the boll weevil is concerned, practically no positive progress has been made. Some negative progress has been made. I mean by that, they have discovered that a great many suggested remedies will not do the business.

Mr. BOOHER. A year ago it was discovered that rotation of crops would destroy the boll weevil. Is that practiced yet?

Mr. LEVER. That is being practiced yet.

Mr. BOOHER. Does it require \$860,000 a year to inculcate that knowledge?

Mr. LEVER. That question has been asked a great many times. I think this language is very unfortunate. It carries the words "boll weevil" in it. My genial friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has always protested against that language, but for certain tactical reasons I have not desired to have those words cut out.

Mr. BOOHER. What are the tactical reasons?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I simply protested against the language used; not against the appropriation or the use made of it.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; only against the language in the appropriation. The tactical reason was that I was afraid if I brought this bill in here with this item changed by striking out the words "boll weevil," I would create a panic among my southern friends, and that is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will ask the gentleman how much money has been appropriated for the boll-weevil proposition?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman offhand. We have been appropriating for it for about 10 years.

Mr. BOOHER. Not less than \$500,000 a year, have we?

Mr. LEVER. Not that much until very recently.

Mr. BOOHER. There has been more than \$3,000,000 appropriated, has there not?

Mr. LEVER. This is the first year the amount has exceeded \$500,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Heretofore it has been carried at \$500,000, has it not?

Mr. LEVER. No; up to last year the Federal appropriation was only about \$250,000 to \$275,000.

Mr. BOOHER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman in charge of the bill knows. Last year, on account of the proviso here striking out the cooperative arrangement which had theretofore existed between the general education board and the Department of Agriculture, which, I think, was a wise provision, this was increased.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, are they making any progress in this work at all toward the destruction of the boll weevil?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend that the work of farm demonstration in the South—getting the boll weevil out of your head now—is absolutely creating a revolution in the agriculture of the South.

Mr. BOOHER. I am not talking about farm-demonstration work. I am in favor of it. I want some information on the subject of boll weevil, if I can get it.

Mr. LEVER. I have been very frank with the gentleman about the boll-weevil proposition. I am very willing to have

an amendment to strike it out, because the language of the bill is misleading.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not want to strike it out. I am trying to find out what progress has been made.

Mr. LEVER. I am telling the gentleman.

Mr. BOOHER. You have not told me.

Mr. LEVER. Either the gentleman is unfortunate or I am.

Mr. BOOHER. I suppose I am unfortunate in my understanding.

Mr. LEVER. No; I think not. I am.

Mr. BOOHER. Over \$3,000,000 has been appropriated to find out some remedy for the boll weevil. What progress has been made?

Mr. LEVER. I stated to the gentleman a moment ago, as plainly as I knew how to state anything, that the entomological work in regard to the boll weevil has not made any affirmative, positive progress. The entomologists disagree with me on that, but in my opinion they have made no positive progress. They have made some negative progress, in this, that a great many remedies suggested by different people have been tried out and found to be useless in checking the ravages of the boll weevil. Whatever positive progress has been made has been due to the cultural methods which the Department of Agriculture is inducing the people of the infected areas in the Southern States to adopt.

Mr. BOOHER. This boll weevil does not infest the whole country. It is only found in spots.

Mr. LEVER. The boll weevil covers the larger part of Texas and Louisiana, a large part of Mississippi, and it is now in Alabama and touching the border of Georgia, and going eastward at the rate of about 50 miles a year.

Mr. BOOHER. Diversified farming is a remedy for it, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. They think so; yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Then why do you want \$600,000 to teach people that diversified farming will stop the boll weevil when they know it already.

Mr. LEVER. My friend thoroughly misunderstands the scope of this work. We are teaching the people how to diversify.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the farmer in your country know enough to sow wheat or oats or rye, or to plant corn when his cotton crop was destroyed the year before, when he has been told by your experts to do so, or do you have to go down there and put it in for him?

Mr. LEVER. No; we do not go down there and put it in for him at all; we do not sow his wheat, we just simply preach to the people the doctrine of diversified agriculture and show them how.

Mr. BOOHER. You have been preaching that for 10 years, have you not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I have been preaching it for 15 years.

Mr. BOOHER. And it has not done any good.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I think it has.

Mr. BOOHER. You have got the same boll weevil down there, have you not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; the boll weevil is there and we will have more in 10 years.

Mr. BOOHER. Then why make this appropriation of money, if you are not accomplishing anything?

Mr. LEVER. We are trying to grow cotton in spite of the boll weevil; and, also, we want the people to diversify their crop growing.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will yield.

Mr. NORTON. I want to ask the chairman of the committee, is it not a fact that this item of \$66,000 is used largely for demonstration work in the South, not pertaining to the eradication of the boll weevil, but to assist in the improvement of farm conditions in the South?

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true to some extent. The chairman of the committee, I thought, had explained that to the gentleman from Missouri. All of the money is used in teaching the farmers how to farm in boll-weevil regions.

Mr. NORTON. Just as the preceding item is used in the North in cooperative demonstration work?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; with the additional amount made necessary by the presence of the boll weevil in the South. I am certain that my friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] is not objecting to the appropriation because it is appropriated for use in the South. I could remind my friend that we very cheerfully appropriated \$600,000 last year to be used in the hog-cholera region, and that was in the Middle West and not in the South.

I hail from a Southern State, and, Mr. Chairman, I stand ready to vote for relief for the people in any section of our country. I do not care whether it is in the East, in the North, or in the West. I am ready to support at any time any measure to aid the farmers in every section of our country. I sometimes grow a little weary with gentlemen who undertake to charge that this committee is appropriating money to aid the South to the detriment and neglect of other sections of the country. This work of eradicating the boll weevil is of vast advantage to the farmers in my section. We have taught the farmers in the section affected by the weevil how to produce some cotton even in his presence. I want to say that one remedy we are teaching the people is to plow the cotton when the weevil is in the small square. Shaking it off by the plow and by the animal coming in contact with the stalk causes the little square to fall, and turning up the fresh soil, moist in the heat of the day, causes the square when it falls on the soil immediately following the plow to get very hot and very dry, and that actually kills the weevil; it steams him to death. But we are teaching the people down there to grow other things than cotton. I want to say to my friend that it is not an easy matter to teach people who have been raising cotton for 100 years, and relying absolutely on that crop, to quit producing cotton. You have got to show them that they can do better by producing other crops.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I do not want the gentleman to think that I am objecting to this appropriation because it is for the South. I am not objecting at all; I am trying to find out what progress has been made. Now, I am going to recommend something to the gentleman; I do not know whether he will follow it or not. The Agricultural Department has published an interesting bulletin, No. 519, on cotton raising. I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama has sent any of those bulletins into his district.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, I think that the farm that the bulletin refers to is in my district.

Mr. BOOHER. Does not the gentleman think that would educate his people?

Mr. HEFLIN. I think, as I have said here once before, that the old negro who claims to have made that tremendous amount of cotton on 2 acres of land—7 bales of cotton on 2 acres of land—produced most of it at night while his neighbors were asleep. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOHER. I know that the gentleman said so, but the Department of Agriculture does not agree with him.

Mr. HEFLIN. Of course, the department is further removed from the premises than I am and knows less about the old, old method of producing cotton in the nighttime. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOHER. The trouble is that the farmer who is so successful in raising the cotton happened to be a colored man, and you would not take any advice from him. Nobody had to go and tell him how to raise cotton, but he did it by hard work. Now, I recommend the gentleman to get 5,000 of these bulletins and distribute them personally to these people, and if he does so they will get rid of the boll weevil in his district. Information on this subject should be welcome, without reference to the source from which it emanates. Why does not the gentleman avail himself of the information contained in Bulletin No. 519 and advise his constituents who are cotton raisers to do likewise?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Unless some one makes the point of order.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I just inquired of the Chair if all time had expired, and I understood the Chair to say that it had.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair meant was that if under the general rule a point of order was made, there was no more time.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Will it be proper to ask for recognition to discuss the amendment after the gentleman from Michigan has spoken?

The CHAIRMAN. According to the way we have been running, unless some one makes the point of order, I think it would be.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel the same about this amendment as I did about the one offered to the preceding paragraph. I think this appropriation ought to be continued this year, so that the work may be continued and extended as it will be, and perhaps appropriations of this kind ought to be continued even a little longer than one year, or until the States have the full benefit of the money coming from the Lever law. But what the chairman of the committee said in answer to an inquiry by a gentleman as to the meaning of this appropriation justifies the action that some of us have taken or attempted, rather, to take with a view of changing this language. These words "boll weevil" ought not to be in the bill at all.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentleman is right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The appropriation has nothing whatever to do with the boll weevil. The money is used for the hire of men and to pay the expenses of men to work and cooperate with the farmers in the South in the study of agricultural problems, and in particular to bring about better agriculture in that part of the country. The need of that effort was made evident by the ravages of the boll weevil. The boll weevil came and devastated the cotton fields, and it was necessary for the people in that section of the country to have some relief, and they asked for an appropriation, and the use of the language "for the relief of the boll-weevil situation" was a subterfuge. I always believed it was a subterfuge, and the House by misapprehension has appropriated this money, believing that it was to be an appropriation to fight the boll weevil, whereas it was simply to teach the people other lines of agriculture, made necessary by the ravages of the boll weevil. Now, the question has been asked as to how this money is used. In the North it is used in this way: The Department of Agriculture will offer to the people of a county—in my State, for instance—the sum of \$1,200 a year to be applied to the payment of a man to do work in that county, on condition that the people of the county, the county authorities or some association organized for that purpose, shall undertake to furnish the rest of the money necessary to pay the salary and expenses of the man, usually from \$2,500 to \$3,000 a year in the aggregate. Perhaps a dozen or 15 men are now employed in my State in that way, covering a dozen or fifteen counties. In addition to that a man is employed in a congressional district to oversee the work of the county men in that district. There are several district men in Michigan. These congressional-district men are paid by the Department of Agriculture altogether out of this appropriation. Then there is one man employed over the entire State, employed jointly by the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural college, and he is paid out of the money furnished by the department out of this appropriation and by the agricultural college out of its own money. Now, that is the work in a general way as it is done in the States of the North. I think the work done in Michigan is typical of the work done in other Northern States. I do not know so much about how it is done in the States of the South. The criticism made by the gentleman from Missouri, that the people in some sections are asking for too much to be done for them, is a proper criticism. The people in some sections of the country, perhaps all of them, have been asking that in various lines of work too much—more than should be asked—shall be done for them. They have not been satisfied with advice or suggestions as to better methods. Many of them asked to have the Federal representatives come in and actually take part with them and do the physical work in connection with their business or the lines of work in which they are engaged.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, this discussion upon the boll weevil has brought out two or three very clever suggestions, one of them from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young], which interested me mightily. His speech was eloquent and it was patriotic. He believes that what benefits one section of the country benefits all sections of the country, and what tends to injure one section of the country tends to injure all sections of the country. That is a fine, splendid, patriotic sentiment, and I believe in it. I believe in it thoroughly with respect to the treatment of farmers in an Agricultural bill. I believe in it thoroughly also with respect to a river and harbor bill, and I believe in it thoroughly with respect to the welfare of all the people of this country, whether employer or employee. Sometimes gentlemen have contended on this floor, and violently, over the question of "special privileges" supposed to be granted to one section of the country above another section or to one kind of industry over another industry, and generally such conflicts have arisen from attacks made upon the eastern and northern industries. So I hail with pleasure and with gratifica-



tion the speech of the gentleman from Texas because of its breadth and its foresight, and I commend the leader of the Republican side of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], for so promptly stating that there was another side of this question affecting our so-called sectional criticisms. Now, here is a bill that proposes to appropriate for the benefit of the country \$22,000,000. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a moment ago made some reference to river and harbor "pork." He alluded to the river and harbor bill.

I contend that the river and harbor appropriation bill is a bill that tends not only to improve the commercial relations of the country and lower the freight rates, but it also gives employment throughout the country to as great an extent as is provided in any other bill. From the answer of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and from the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] it does not appear that the bulk of this appropriation of \$666,000 for the treatment of the boll weevil goes to the labor of the country. Apparently it is not put in circulation to feed the men who work upon the farm; it is expended rather in the payment of salaried men, who are specialists or instructors, whose duty it is to teach the plodding farmer how to do his work. Now, I am in favor of the farmer who does the farm work, just as I am in favor of the man who works upon river and harbor improvements, or who dirties his hands in digging the canal. These are the kind of men I want to help, whether they live in Texas or up in Pennsylvania.

I question whether we are doing much to help these men here, since most of this appropriation of \$666,000 goes to pay the specialists who tell the workingman how to work. I believe in the elimination of the boll weevil, and I want you gentlemen to get this money. I think you ought to have it. But I think it is only fair to say that if the appropriation is intended wholly and solely for those who have been trained to instruct, rather than to work, it would be better to frame our agricultural bills and our river and harbor bills, so that actual labor, whether in the factory or on the farm, may have at least an equal chance at our hands, along with our intellectual friends, the specialists. [Applause.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Mr. Chairman, this matter was thrashed out in the committee for a long time, and if the committee had taken my advice in regard to the matter there would have been no occasion for this lengthy discussion on the subject.

When the men from the Department of Agriculture in charge of the expenditure of this \$666,000 were before our committee, I asked them what success they had had in exterminating the boll weevil. They said they had had no success whatever and had no hope of exterminating that pest. Then I wanted to know why they retained this language in the bill, and they could not give any excuse for it.

I suggested to the committee at the time that it would be well to strike out these words, "and for the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton-boll weevil," leaving this section worded identically as the preceding section, except that it was inside the cotton belt; not outside.

There is no man from the North who will oppose an appropriation of whatever sum of money is necessary for farm demonstration work in the South, but I believe it is wrong to leave language in this bill that is absolutely misleading. People in the North who do not know the situation can not understand why we appropriate money that can not be used for the purpose expressed in the bill or for the accomplishment of anything practical in that line for the benefit of the South. It is absolutely misleading, and I think if we were wise enough to strike out these words it would obviate the necessity for lengthy discussions of this matter in the future when it has no bearing upon the value of this appropriation whatever.

While I do not now want to submit an amendment, because the committee turned it down—and I am perfectly willing to stand by the judgment of the committee—I still believe that it would be a wise thing to strike out this language, so that this discussion will not occur annually over these words and over this same sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, an amendment is pending. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, \$120,000, as follows: Alaska, \$40,000; Hawaii, \$35,000; Porto Rico, \$30,000; and Guam, \$15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, and this fund shall be available until used: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated for the experiment station in Hawaii \$5,000 may be used in agricultural extension work in Hawaii.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 64, line 11, as follows: "And this fund shall be available until used."

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That hereafter there be prepared by the Department of Agriculture an annual report on the work and expenditures of the agricultural experiment stations established under the act of Congress of March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 440), on the work and expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in connection therewith, and on the cooperative agricultural extension work and expenditures of the Department of Agriculture and of agricultural colleges under the act of May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture;" and that there be printed annually 8,000 copies of said report, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. This is purely legislation.

Mr. BARNHART. It is new legislation, to begin with, Mr. Chairman, and it makes it permanent law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen may be right, but I have an idea that they are not, and I am going to call the attention of the Chair to page 253—the present occupant of the chair has that volume there—of "Laws Applicable to the United States Department of Agriculture." At the bottom of page 253 I will read:

That there be printed 8,000 copies of the report of the Director of the Office of Experiment Stations, prepared under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, on the work and expenditures of that office and of the agricultural experiment stations established in the several States and Territories under the law of Congress of March 2, 1887, for 1903, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture; and that annually thereafter a similar report shall be prepared and printed, the edition to be the same as for the report herein provided.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If that is the law, what is the purpose of this item in the bill?

Mr. LEVER. The explanation given by the chief of the bureau was that inasmuch as the department under its scheme of reorganization has changed the name of this service, there might be some question about the authority. He thinks he has the authority to print, but he wanted to be absolutely sure. I say I am not sure that this is a change of existing law. I am in doubt about it myself.

Mr. MANN. There is no doubt about it changing existing law.

Mr. LEVER. I am ready for the Chair to rule.

Mr. MANN. Is the only explanation that of the change in the name?

Mr. LEVER. That is the only explanation given in the committee.

Mr. MANN. As I recalled, when I saw this item, we now get a quota—

Mr. LEVER. The House now gets 2,000 copies—

Mr. MANN. Of these reports?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And this does not change what we now get?

Mr. LEVER. This language here would just continue that exactly. That is the only purpose. It may be that the item is subject to a point of order. I am in doubt about it, and the department is in doubt about it, but they very frankly confess that. But they said they thought it was well to let them continue to make these reports. I think this is a very valuable document.

Mr. MANN. Of course if it is to continue reports now being printed, and this paragraph is necessary because of the change of name, I would not make a point of order against it.

Mr. LEVER. They included, in addition, only the agricultural extension bill in this language. The reports will also cover the operations under the agricultural extension act. That is all there is to it. I do not believe it is subject to a point of order myself.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Chair to Rule XI, on page 363 of the Manual. It reads:

All proposed legislation or orders touching printing shall be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing on the part of the House.

Then I want to call the attention of the Chair to section 2, paragraph 4, of the act of March 1, 1907, which reads as follows:

Orders for printing extra copies otherwise than herein provided for shall be by simple, concurrent, or joint resolution.

Further on it says:

Such resolutions when presented to either House shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who in making their report shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing, upon the estimate of the Public Printer.

Mr. LEVER. Is the gentleman reading from the statute?

Mr. BARNHART. I am reading from the statute. I have given the Chair the citation.

Mr. LEVER. But this is authorized under that joint resolution.

Mr. BARNHART. It should be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. LEVER. What is the necessity of referring it to the Committee on Printing when it is already law? This is an exception to the gentleman's proposition. It seems to me the language is clearly in order, under the explanation I have made in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. BARNHART. How could the gentleman do it under the act of 1914 if his premise is true?

Mr. LEVER. I have tried to explain, in the first place, that this is nothing more than a continuation of work authorized under this joint resolution which I read to the Chair a moment ago. In the second place, answering the gentleman's other question, the department had some doubt as to their authority to do this work.

Now, in my own judgment, I think they have the authority. I am a little in doubt about it, I confess, but they want to do the work that they have been doing and that they were authorized to do under the old Office of Experiment Stations. The name of that office is now changed, and they want to do exactly the same work, except that they want to include in it the extension work. I think it is authorized.

Mr. BARNHART. Over and above all, it is a move to secure further privileges of public printing for a department. These department heads seek from time to time to get all of the appropriation allowances they can in the sundry civil or other appropriation bills, and then come directly and indirectly to Congress to get more and more. Personally I have no objection whatever to publishing every possible document that will conduce to larger success in agriculture or any other department of human endeavor, but I know from my own experience that it is the general disposition of these departments to go before the Committee on Appropriations and get all that they can secure there, and then come to the other committees of the House, or to the House itself, and ask for more, in order that they may exploit certain notions of their own with the general appropriations; and then when the Congress wants anything for the benefit of the people generally, it must make additional appropriation, as the departments utilize all of their printing allotments as they choose to do.

Mr. Chairman, if it is in order for the Committee on Agriculture—I will not say to usurp the functions of the Committee on Appropriations, but to assume its functions in this respect—and also to assume the functions of the Committee on Printing, then the rule which I have just cited has no force.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering: One director, who shall be a scientist and have charge of all scientific and technical work, \$4,500; 1 draftsman, \$1,920; 1 chief clerk, \$1,900; 2 clerks, class 4; four clerks, class 3; 1 clerk or editorial clerk, \$1,600; 1 clerk, \$1,500; 1 clerk, \$1,440; 2 clerks or instrument makers, at \$1,440 each; 1 clerk or fabricator, \$1,440; 2 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,380; 2 clerks, at \$1,320 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,260 each; 5 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk or editorial clerk, \$1,200; 1 clerk or draftsman, \$1,200; 1 clerk or draftsman, \$900; 1 clerk or photographer, \$1,200; 1 clerk or photographer, \$1,000; 2 clerks, at \$1,140 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,080 each; 1 clerk, \$1,020; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 3 clerks, at \$900 each; 1

clerk or instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 messenger or laboratory helper, \$840; 2 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers, at \$720 each; 1 messenger or laborer, \$660; 5 messengers, laborers, or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 5 laborers, messenger boys, or charwomen, at \$480 each; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$75,960.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to line 17—

Mr. LEVER. On what page?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On page 66:

One clerk or editorial clerk, \$1,600.

And then, in line 22:

One clerk or editorial clerk, \$1,200.

I presume those are the gentlemen who perform these meritorious services, of which I gave an illustration yesterday, of preparing these bulletins for the press. This is the first place where I have seen them appropriated for. They have these gentlemen in all the other departments, but no man on this floor can find out how they are paid. What are the duties of these distinguished editorial clerks, and what do they do?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that I think the language of the items explain just about what you could expect their duties to be. I have not looked into that. The gentleman understands that it is impossible for me to know the duties of every clerk and employee in the Agricultural Department. That is a physical impossibility. I think they get out bulletins—

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. As I remember the explanation made by the department of the work of these clerks, it is that they prepare the manuscripts sent in to them by the writers in the department for printing at the Printing Office.

Mr. LEVER. That is the inference I draw from it, of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The other day I took occasion to look up the traveling expenses of the department. I had the data on the desk, but it is gone now. I found where they paid some man \$10, expenses to go down to Richmond, Va., to see about purchasing a printing press for the Forestry Service to be sent out to Utah. I was wondering what the Forestry Service needed with a printing press in that State.

Mr. LEVER. I should wonder about that myself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And whether it is a part of the duty of one of these editorial clerks to edit some paper in Utah.

Mr. LEVER. I have no information about printing presses at Denver, and of course I do not know anything about the \$12 to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I can look up the item.

Mr. LEVER. I do not question the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I had it on my desk, but I can not find it now. I think it is to be commended that in this bill it states here what these items are for. In the Post Office Department they have a gentleman by the name of McAdam, who prepares these bulletins, and so far as I have been able to find it is not possible to ascertain how he is paid. He is not under the civil service, but he is there on a salary, telling what a great and glorious work the Post Office Department is doing.

Mr. LEVER. I wish the gentleman would send me the information about the printing press in Utah.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman will find it in the accounts of traveling expenses, but I will furnish it to him. I do not say that none of the bulletins are of any value, for some of them are, but it has gotten to be an abuse. Take the bulletins issued by the Agricultural Department, and most of them are valuable; but such a bulletin as I read here yesterday, sent out over the country where we appropriate \$100,000 a year for that kind of nonsense, is an abuse. The principal object of some of these bulletins is to create a sentiment to compel us to make more appropriations for the bureau. You will see a great many containing insidious attacks on Congress and say if Congress would only appropriate more money so they could investigate certain things they could do great service to the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. I notice in the item a salary for clerks and employees at \$1,920 a year. How does the committee or the department fix a salary at \$1,920 instead of \$1,900 or \$1,950?

Mr. LEVER. It is their method of division; it is at the rate of \$160 a month.

Mr. BARKLEY. They fix it by the month?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.



Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not recall when this bureau was established. Is the gentleman able to tell me the year?

Mr. LEVER. No; I have not the record here, but it was 8 or 10 or 15 years ago.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the gentleman tell me the amount of this appropriation originally?

Mr. LEVER. That would be hard to recall.

Mr. BUTLER. I know that we ask the gentleman from South Carolina many questions that we ought not to ask him; we use him as a sort of encyclopedia.

Mr. LEVER. The original appropriation was very small.

Mr. BUTLER. And yet the office expenses have crept up to \$75,960.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that there is an apparent increase in the statutory roll of \$23,000 on account of transfers of certain items carried in other parts of the bill. The Roads Office has grown very rapidly.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate that it has grown very rapidly, and especially the appropriations. I should like to know something about the activity of this bureau. Will the gentleman tell us what it is the bureau really does in the way of assisting in the construction and maintenance of good roads? It does no more than advise?

Mr. LEVER. The Government, of course, conducts a great many experiments in road building, as to the best kind of road machinery, but does not enter into the building of roads except probably a mile here and there as a demonstration proposition. They do give advice in the construction of roads.

Suppose that a county in my State has issued bonds for the construction of roads. The department will be called upon to send an expert or a specialist to go over the local conditions and the best methods of expending the money and the best kind of roads to be built.

Mr. BUTLER. Has not the State of South Carolina its own road department?

Mr. LEVER. We do not have any central department; no State institution; it is a county organization.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, this bureau does have an official who goes about and advises as to the kind and character of roads to be built.

Mr. LEVER. They do.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know how many officials they have traveling around giving advice?

Mr. LEVER. I can not; but that can easily be ascertained.

Mr. BUTLER. Gentlemen understand how much easier it is to get this information from him than it is to hunt it up. As I understand, they decide on the advisability of the territory where they are invited to go examine the character of the ground and advise the authorities what sort of a road to build.

Mr. LEVER. They look over the material, and then they have to determine, considering the kind and quantity of material, the most economical and the best way to build the roads in that locality.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that they not only advise as to the best road to be built, but they allow the engineer of the department to stay on the ground and instruct the local officials how best to build the road, and allow him to remain for two or three weeks until they are advised properly how to construct the road.

Mr. LEVER. That statement is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to make this observation. I am greatly interested in road construction, but I believe it is a factor in our public life that ought to be worked out by different communities and different States. I believe that much of this appropriation of \$660,000 is absolutely wrong and a waste of money. But there is no use of making any objection to it here. I live in a community where we build our own roads. The State of Pennsylvania has its own road department, or a department of public roads, where we can obtain instruction if we see fit. This appropriation has grown to the enormous sum of \$600,000, and inasmuch as we may next year have to hold out our hats, I think we ought to reduce some of these expenses.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The interest in public-road building all over the United States has increased to such an extent that it justifies to some extent the additional appropriation in this bill. I can give a succinct illustration that occurred in my country. They had a certain kind of material down there, and they were in doubt whether a road could be constructed of that material.

Mr. BUTLER. But it would not cost \$60,000—

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. They want to build it for the purpose of demonstrating that the material could be used and

that it could be built with benefit to the community and economy to the country.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for about three minutes. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state Indiana has more good roads than any other State in the Union and it has made more progress in the development of good roads probably in the last three or four years than any other section of the country in road making. These appropriations have been made from time to time and continue to grow, and while I am not in favor of large appropriations of this character, I do believe, from the fact that we have a skilled force of men going throughout the country to demonstrate with very little cost that good roads can be scientifically and economically made and the way to construct them, that Congress ought to take advantage of that opportunity which it now has. I know that one county in the district which I represent has built and in process of construction 600 miles of stone roads. They have had a man from the Department of Agriculture who had given the people in that section some instructions in building gravel and stone roads, and it happens, Mr. Chairman, that the character of the soil is of a loamy character and does not contain much gravel, and they have been able to continue this gentleman from the Department of Agriculture there for three weeks to get this sort of instruction, which is very valuable to the people of that community; and I am satisfied that as long as the Government has made this expenditure and has increased this appropriation, that the value and benefit of such information disseminated throughout the country can not be overestimated. I merely wanted to make that observation, which came within my range of view.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I desire to call attention to the paragraph of this bill which provides for an expenditure of \$75,960 for a civil force in this bureau. In this paragraph there is no provision made—I can not find it—to pay for an official who visited the community of which the gentleman spoke to give instructions. I have noticed this item grow from an inch long until it covers a page. It is mighty expensive, and I simply here make my protest and give notice that if I live to be a Member of Congress when the Republicans come into power I intend to make an effort to get rid of this item or greatly reduce it.

Mr. CLINE. I desire to say to the gentleman I am not out of harmony very much with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said; but inasmuch as we have increased these expenditures to the extent we have, and inasmuch as we have experts on hand, and inasmuch as we have men who know the necessity for the dissemination of knowledge is very great, I believe that we ought to make use of what we now have. As a general proposition I am opposed to all appropriations of this character; but from the fact that we have now large experience, derived from former appropriations, I think that advantage ought to be taken of it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I have often wondered what the men engaged in the Office of Public Roads do for a living, and I still continue to wonder why it is we continue to increase the number of men whose employment is of an uncertain character, and I am still more at a loss to understand why it is that the Office of Public Roads has included in its functions an investigation and report on the utilization of water in farm irrigation. We have in another department, I believe, a bureau that has charge of irrigation subjects of the country; but what irrigation has to do with road building is more than I can understand; and yet there is a paragraph in this bill, under the head of "Office of Public Roads," for investigation and report on utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice, an appropriation of \$106,400.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the item has heretofore been carried under the Office of Experiment Stations and has been transferred here because it was thought it was more nearly an engineering proposition and logically belonged to this bureau.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it has no more to do with road building than the man in the moon has, not a bit. It is only another way of pretending to give an organization that has nothing to do from the outset some excuse for existing.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield again? Because I know he does not want to do anybody an injustice. The gentleman will notice that the title of this office has been changed to read, "Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering."

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I understand that.

Mr. LEVER. And the change which was made was to meet the criticism which the gentleman is making, so as to make it really indicate the character of the work being done under it.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if men are employed in the Road Construction Bureau because of their expert knowledge of materials that are required and the conditions under which roads are to be constructed in various sections of the country, the further admission must be that these men are not qualified to do the thing which this section authorizes the men in the Road Building Bureau to do.

Mr. LEVER. Well, now, the gentleman has his facts wrong again, and I want to keep him straight, because I know he does not want to state the facts wrongly. The organization heretofore existed in the Office of Experiment Stations, and has been bodily transferred over here.

Mr. MADDEN. Why it should be transferred to the jurisdiction of a general manager, or whatever his title may be, director of good roads, is a matter I can not understand. This man who has charge of experiments in road building has no knowledge whatever, if I understand the man, of the duties that are to be performed in connection with the investigation of the utilization of water in farm irrigation.

And then it goes on further and gives the authority to this man to investigate and report upon farm drainage and upon the drainage of swamp lands and wet lands, which may be made available for agricultural purposes. I had supposed that when you authorized men to develop agriculture you would find men who were qualified to advise as to what the best method of agriculture is. We are pretending here in this paragraph of the bill to employ men who are versed in the best methods of road building, and I have some doubt about whether we have accomplished the object for which this law is intended even then, because I do not regard the man at the head of the Office of Public Roads as the best qualified man to give advice as to how roads should be built or as to the materials to be used in the construction of roads. On the other hand, I believe that every community in America best understands its own needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I believe that all communities naturally employ the materials which are in closest proximity to the road that is to be built, no matter what advice they get as to what is the best material abstractly for the construction of a road. After all, the cost of building a road is the prime consideration entering into the question of its construction, and, although it may be quite well understood by an expert or even by a layman that a granite road would be much preferable to a burned-clay road or that a crushed-stone road or a road made of macadam or concrete would be better than an ordinary dirt road, the financial condition of the people of the community would be such that they would not want to build either kind of road, and no matter what kind of advice they might get from the expert they would decide the question altogether upon their financial condition. So after all, in the case of a community in South Carolina, for example, where the gentleman who is chairman of this committee [Mr. LEVER] lives, his people would assemble their officials and decide whether they wanted to build the road. They might ask how the road would be constructed in the best way by somebody, but when the time came when they would conclude and determine how much money they were going to spend on the building of the road the taxpayers would decide that question, and the advice of the expert from Washington would be wholly unnecessary and ignored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering: For salaries and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, office fixtures, apparatus, traveling and all other necessary expenses, for conducting investigations and experiments, and for collating, reporting, and illustrating the results of same, and for preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins and reports, as follows: *Provided*, That no part of these appropriations shall be expended for the rent or purchase of road-making machinery, except such as may be necessary for field experimental work as hereinafter provided for.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Answering the inquiry of the chairman [Mr. LEVER] awhile ago, I have that item now. It is found in the expenditures for traveling from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia, performed by certain officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

I find I was in error as to where they wanted to send the printing press. I find, on page 55, this item:

Ballard, C. M., clerk, Richmond, Va., and return, January 21, 1914: To examine, with a view to purchase, "Humana" automatic press feeder for printing office at supply depot, Ogden, Utah.

That is under the Forest Service.

Mr. LEVER. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I would like to see a printing plant established out there, and we have found it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, as to this proposition of printing these bulletins, I have a few more suggestions to make. I know I am talking out of order, but I will not consume more than five minutes. I hold in my hand a Weekly News Letter to Crop Correspondents. I understand that is printed in the Department of Agriculture. I do not know whether I am right about that or not. I am only speaking on hearsay. I recognize they have the right to print bulletins in the Weather Bureau. The law specifically provides that. Is there any specific provision giving the Department of Agriculture the right to print these bulletins?

Mr. LEVER. No specific authorization that I know of, and I am inclined to think they do not print this in the Department of Agriculture. My own idea is that it is printed at the Government Printing Office. Of course the Department of Agriculture gets up the facts.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It is undoubtedly printed under the direction of the Government Printing Office, because it is so stated at the bottom.

Now I want to call attention to a decision that I have here from the Comptroller of the Treasury, under date of December 11, 1914, which I think the chairman of the Committee on Printing [Mr. BARNHART], who is not here just at present, ought to have brought to his attention.

The decision is that they have no authority to purchase printing presses for any of these departments unless it is especially given them by act of Congress, and that they have no right to print these various documents that come from these departments without authority.

Now, the duplications of all these bulletins of the character to which I called attention yesterday are merely subterfuges. It is simply a violation of the regulations to print. While they are manifolded, they are still simply printed, and they keep a great number of men employed in that work, estimated to cost, as I said, \$100,000 a year. There is no excuse for their doing that, because here is a decision of the comptroller delivered recently to this very Bureau of Good Roads that we have just passed. They wanted to purchase a printing press and use it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print this decision in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the decision referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the decision referred to:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, December 11, 1914.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

Sir: I have your letter of December 3, 1914, requesting a decision upon whether a printing press may be purchased for the use of the Office of Public Roads to do certain printing upon tracings, engineering drawings, maps, and plans prepared by said office.

You state that in preparing them "several different styles of letters are required and in many cases only one impression is necessary. It is desirable for the draftsman who prepares the tracing or plan to select the style of type and in many cases to make the impression himself after setting up the form." Also "that it is impracticable to have the Government Printing Office do the lettering or printing on these plans and tracings."

It is proposed to purchase the printing press under the item in the appropriation "General expenses, Office of Public Roads" (Public, No. 122, p. 27), as follows:

"For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads, and the best kinds of road-making materials, and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance, \$145,000."

Where printing offices are authorized in the departments they are required to be under the control of the Public Printer, who is to furnish all presses, etc., from the general supplies of the Government Printing Office. (Sec. 31, act of Jan. 12, 1895.)

The authority to use a department appropriation for the purchase of a printing press must be considered with respect to the statutory provision, supra, and the further provision in the statute (sec. 87) that all printing for the executive departments shall be done at the Government Printing Office.



In Ninth Miscellaneous Comptroller's Decisions, page 47, April 6, 1899, section 31, supra, was viewed by this office as prohibiting the Division of Vegetable Pathology of the Department of Agriculture from procuring and operating its own press for the printing of scientific names for labeling herbarium specimens, although at times only one or two of the same kind were required, and there seemed to be inconveniences and practical difficulties in complying with the law.

In the present case I understand the use of a printing press as commonly understood is necessary, and that the work to be done thereby is none other than printing. Whatever may be said as to purchasing printing presses in the nature of labor-saving machines, and under an appropriation for such machines, as was the case in Seventeenth Comptroller's Decisions, page 349, cited by you, the statutory provisions, supra, necessarily must exclude the furnishing of printing presses under general department appropriations, and if I were to authorize the purchase under such an appropriation it would be not so much a construction of the permissible uses of an appropriation as an arbitrary permission to make such use.

The impracticability there is stated to be in having the work done at the Government Printing Office does not permit me to go to the extent of authorizing a printing press to be installed in your department, but is matter for addressing to Congress supporting a request to make specific provision therefor. In absence of such authority in the appropriation in question its use for the purchase of a printing press is not authorized.

Respectfully,

GEO. H. DOWNEY,  
Comptroller.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BUTLER. I find a proviso in this paragraph which denies to this bureau the privilege of purchasing road-making machinery. Does this bureau purchase road-making machinery?

Mr. LEVER. It can not, except under the terms of the proviso.

Mr. BUTLER. Not under this "except such as may be necessary for field experimental work as hereinafter provided for"? Does the gentleman have the information at hand from which I can learn about how much money this bureau spends every year in the purchase of what is known as road-making machinery?

Mr. LEVER. I presume we have it here somewhere, but I can not tell offhand. This proviso was put on this bill on the floor of the House to prevent what members of the committee thought might be an abuse. We did give them the authority to purchase some machinery for experimental purposes. Just how much they have expended I do not know. Of course we have the facts, but I can not lay my hand on them. They are available.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman direct my attention to some publication by which I can learn just what this bureau does with its money?

Mr. LEVER. There is a large book known as "Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture." I refer the gentleman to that.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman. Now, does the gentleman know of any public roads that this bureau has constructed?

Mr. LEVER. My colleague [Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina] has a mile of model road which was built in his county.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the gentleman from South Carolina tell me how I can get them to build a piece of road at my home?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; go down and see them about it.

Mr. BUTLER. No; there is no use of my going down to see them. I will get my friend to do it. I should like to have 25 miles of good roads built, and yet I would not ask the Government to build a road that the people there ought to build for themselves.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows that these are nothing but model roads, built for demonstration.

Mr. BUTLER. If it is a road a foot long, built by the United States, I call that a special privilege, and inasmuch as the Government has ordered off rural carriers on the ground that the service is a special privilege, I say this is all wrong for the same reason.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. They do not build any roads at all. They simply instruct the people in the construction of the roads.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I want to say that possibly the chairman of the committee has been misunderstood by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in stating that a mile of road in my district was built by the Government. That mile of road in my county was built by the county, and every cent of the expense of it paid by the county. All the United States Government did was to send its engineer there to supervise its construction and advise them as to the best methods to be used in its construction.

Mr. LEVER. My colleague [Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina] states the fact which I attempted to state. My language misled my friend from Pennsylvania, but I had not intended it to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. I congratulate the people of South Carolina on their ability to take care of themselves, instead of standing around the Treasury holding out their hands for something that does not belong to them alone. This is all wrong, and the gentlemen who stand for it will regret it.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. During the debate on Tuesday, concerning expenditures in the Forest Service, I was unable to be present on the floor and participate in the discussion, but I have read in the Record the very serious strictures made by some Members concerning the operations of the Forest Service and its great expense to the Government and the necessity for an investigation concerning its operations. I hold in my hand a copy of some resolutions that were adopted by the Longmont Commercial Association in the growing and active city of Longmont, Colo. I desire that those resolutions be read in my time, as they bear directly upon the paragraph which is now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The resolutions will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### Resolution.

Whereas the Longmont Commercial Association, through its authorized representatives, has been apprised of the plans of the Forest Service in regard to the construction of roads and trails in the Colorado National Forest; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the members of the Longmont Commercial Association that said proposed improvements portray a real knowledge on the part of the Forest Service of the needs of the people, and, planned from such knowledge, tend toward the most effective and comprehensive development and use of the forest; and

Whereas the aforementioned plans of the Forest Service, if permitted to be brought to a successful conclusion, will render all points of the Colorado National Forest accessible, and in so doing will serve to develop the wonderful scenic and economic resources of the region: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Longmont Commercial Association, That the plans of the Forest Service for the construction of roads and trails in the Colorado National Forest are hereby given hearty indorsement; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly and respectfully urge the cordial support of the Colorado congressional delegation to such measures of financial appropriation and otherwise as will tend toward an early completion of the work herein outlined.

Attest:

D. W. THOMAS, Secretary.

LONGMONT, COLO., January 11, 1915.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment being withdrawn, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the best methods of road making, especially ordinary sand-clay and dirt roads, and the best kinds of road-making materials, and for furnishing expert advice on road building and maintenance, \$145,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to say a word here commenting on the objection made to some of these appropriations because they provide for work to be done by agents and representatives of the department, which work ought to be done by the people of the communities themselves. I believe much of that objection is good. There is a growing disposition on the part of the people all over the country to ask appropriations for the employment of men, to be paid by Federal appropriations, to go into local communities to do work the people themselves ought to do. Now, in this road bureau there have been demands upon the bureau for men and machinery for the actual building of roads, whereas the work of the officers and representatives of the department should be simply to give advice and make suggestions as to the character of the material to be used and methods of construction, while the work itself should be done by the people themselves.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. In the limited time I have I can not yield. The gentleman will excuse me. This disposition is not limited to any particular section of the country. In the South, when they were trying to eliminate the cattle tick, the people were asking to have not only demonstrations and experiments made, but that vats for dipping should be built by the Federal Government. In Massachusetts and other parts of New England, where the Government was making an effort to stop the ravages of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth, it was determined by the representatives of the Bureau of Entomology that the best way was to clear out the brush along the highways and along the railroad tracks, because vehicles and railroad trains passing back and forth knocked down and carried along the nests of the moths and distributed them to other places.

The people of New England, usually willing to pay their own money and to do their own work, demanded that the department itself should do the work, and the result was that this experimental, highly scientific bureau, the Bureau of Entomology,

at one time employed as many as 500 men in doing nothing more or less than cutting brush along the highways. The members of the Agricultural Committee will bear me out when I say I have opposed appropriations for that kind of work, as I have stood strongly against like appropriations, or to be similarly used, in other parts of the country, insisting that it is the duty of the department to make investigations and experiments to learn the best means and the best methods, to learn evils and the best way to overcome them, and then, after learning the way and being able to point out the way, that its work should be limited entirely to pointing out the way in which the people themselves should do the work.

Now, in relation to this particular matter, it will be noticed that we have refused permission to the Office of Public Roads to buy machinery. It was demanded of them that expensive road-building machinery be purchased and that the bureau send out forces of men to use these machines and actually do the physical work and in some cases pay the entire expense of building the roads. It is a wrong policy; we have stood against it and have tried to prevent it by the insertion of this proviso, and we ought to go further—the effort of the committee ought to be, and the Congress ought to approve its recommendations, to limit these appropriations to the making of investigations and experiments and to pointing out the best way to the people; and the people themselves ought to be required or permitted to do the actual work themselves.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan, to ask the chairman a question. I want to learn, because I am preparing myself for a fight in the future against this appropriation of the public funds, which I think is absolutely unnecessary and wrong. I do not criticize the gentleman from South Carolina or his committee. I helped to grow into present practices. I voted for the Shackleford bill, but I thought it would produce some good roads. Now, I wish to ask the chairman a question. I find here an appropriation for a system of road management. Will the gentleman please tell me what on earth is "road management"?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The maintenance of the road, I suppose. I do not know unless it is road maintenance, the method of managing and taking care of the road. I know in some places the people have taxed themselves to build a road, and then they have constructed it and gone off and left it to maintain itself. They thought that all that was necessary was to construct it, and left it to take care of itself.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate the gentleman's statement; it is wise, and we will all profit by it. I suppose one official from the Government will come along and tell the people that here is a puddle in the road, and you ought to get rid of the puddle, and I will determine for you whether to drain it or put some stones in it. Is that management?

Mr. LEVER. I will give the gentleman the information. It is work covering general statistics and research, investigation and experimental maintenance, and the economical study of highway system and traffic. Lectures, demonstrations on road and bridge models, instruction on highway engineering, maintenance of State index. They employ a corps of collaborators, one in each State.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has read well. I only wish I was able to understand it as well. I find in the next paragraph, "Investigation of the best methods of road making." Will the gentleman tell me how the fine discrimination is made between road management and road making?

Mr. LEVER. Under this item we send out experts to the town where the citizens want to build a road, and these experts advise as to the best method of building the road under the peculiar conditions that may exist there.

Mr. BUTLER. Then will the other agent arrive and advise them on the method of managing the road?

Mr. LEVER. No; I think the method of management is left as a scientific matter.

Mr. BUTLER. Then the two do not go together and ride in the same car?

Mr. LEVER. No; the first part of it is scientific work and the other is practical.

Mr. BUTLER. I notice that you provide that the office of director shall be filled by a scientist.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; he is a scientist and a graduate of Harvard.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not understand how a Harvard graduate should know any more about road building than I do, and I never was a graduate.

Mr. LEVER. He is a graduate from the engineering department and regarded as one of the great engineers of the world.

Mr. BUTLER. I take my hat off to him. I did not know of his proportions.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There are certain roads in an adjoining State, Maryland, that are dirt roads, and at certain seasons are very bad and certainly need attention. I want to ask if the bureau recently created has measured up to its expectations. Has it done good work and been helpful to the country?

Mr. LEVER. I read the report of the chief of the bureau some nights ago, and with reference to the sand, clay, and dirt roads I feel that he is doing very satisfactory work.

Mr. GOULDEN. What will be the average cost of these dirt roads per mile? I heard an estimate made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] placing it at \$400, but I thought that was rather low.

Mr. LEVER. From \$400 to \$1,580, depending upon conditions.

Mr. GOULDEN. It would depend also on the proximity of the clay and the sand, the material used in making these improved roads.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is there much demand on the department at this time, or in 1914, for instruction in this kind of road building in the engineering department? This, I understand, costs the various communities nothing.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; more than they could meet, and cost nothing.

Mr. GOULDEN. I ask because I have in mind making a request myself in the near future.

Mr. RUBEN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 200 of the hearings, in which he will find all this information as to dirt and clay roads.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I do that in order to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, a question in regard to the road engineers. Who determines whether they are engineers? Is there a school or department that educates them and do they have a diploma? Who determines whether they are competent engineers?

Mr. LEVER. They are appointed through civil-service examination, which determines their competency. Of course, an examination would be established in order to determine whether they are competent men or not.

Mr. KREIDER. In view of the fact that there are two separate items provided in the bill—one of \$42,000 for road management and another of \$145,000 for road building and road maintenance—are the same engineers qualified to do both or does it require one engineer to show them how to manage the road and another how to build and maintain it?

Mr. LEVER. As I tried to explain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago, the work under the first item to which the gentleman refers is largely scientific, constituting the whole big problem of the best method of road management. Of course, it would take a high-grade man for that kind of work. The work under this item of \$145,000 is largely in sending out engineers to carry to the country the information that has been gathered by the other men. The one is scientific and the other is taking the information out to the people and demonstrating it.

Mr. KREIDER. Is it not a fact that scientific road-building work and the science of road building are so closely allied that it is a very difficult matter to separate the two?

Mr. LEVER. That is very true.

Mr. KREIDER. The point I want to make is this—

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me, I have no doubt that the man who goes out and supervises the building of one of these roads will probably be a competent man for the work on the item before, but not necessarily so.

Mr. KREIDER. My thought was this: That it would not be necessary to double up expenses by sending two men possibly 500 miles from their home office.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman misunderstands this entirely. I think. In the item carrying \$42,000 the department does not send its experts out into the country to teach the people how to manage their roads. Whatever field work the men of the department do at all is going out into the field hunting up from other folks the management of roads so as to develop the best system of management. It is a scientific expert study of the problem of road management, and on a road proposition such as suggested a moment ago they would not send one of that type of men to show the people at Aiken, S. C., how to manage that little amount of road.

Mr. KREIDER. When they have acquired the knowledge, how do they distribute that knowledge? Do they publish it through the form of a bulletin?

Mr. LEVER. No; they distribute that information through bulletins and also the item carrying the \$145,000.



Mr. KREIDER. Well, that is for road building and making.  
 Mr. LEVER. And expert advice, if the gentleman will read.  
 The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.  
 Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.  
 The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials, \$34,820.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] was addressing himself to this amendment, I tried to obtain some time from him in order to ask him a question. I think the gentleman was fair and considerate in his remarks concerning the desire and disposition of the people to constantly impose upon the Federal Government for work and money in the conduct of local enterprises that should be developed properly and justly by individuals either singly or jointly. I purposed to ask the gentleman this question, if he did not think that that desire on the part of the people was largely promoted by Congress in the character of legislation proposed and considered, and in voting large sums of money for purposes which are more or less indefinite in character? That Congress is showing by some of the provisions of bills of this character and the appropriation of large sums of money in an indefinite way without giving actual knowledge as to how the money is to be spent, and how it has been expended from former appropriations, and how easy it is to extract money from the Treasury. The people hear of these large sums and what has been expended in this locality and in the others for various purposes, and are thus stimulated to secure from the Government, if possible, that which they think has been denied them. Then these bureaus, through the dissemination of bulletins and literature, some of which is largely unreliable and not at all necessary, arouse in the minds of the public a desire to secure from the Government that support and that assistance that they are unwilling to contribute themselves. I believe that the fault, if any exists, largely rests upon the shoulders of Congress and does not rest upon the people.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate what the gentleman says. Congress has grown. I can recall the time when Congress did practically nothing of this character, and I am willing to confess I grew along with Congress in this kind of work. I do not object to instructions being given upon public road building. I do not object to such assistance. What I object to is this enormously extravagant, in my judgment almost useless, expenditure for office hire, clerks, messengers, and charwomen. I want the money to go where it will assist in the construction of work and be used for the purpose which Congress would have it used for. Remember, I do not object to this instruction, let me say to the gentleman. I do not object to such—

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Does not the gentleman believe that a large proportion of every dollar of money that we appropriate for this purpose is used purely in clerical ways, and that it has not had the effect which was intended?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and more than correct. The same thing he says here now I have heard said many times in this House, and yet we have not advanced one step to correct the evils which we all saw before us. In the community in which I live there is a pike—now, let me call the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina to it, so that he may have it in his mind when he prepares his next bill—the first pike built in the United States is the one running from Lancaster to Philadelphia, built in 1795. That pike has stood all these years without ever moving, unaffected by the heat of summer or the cold of winter. The builders never employed an engineer. It was built by the people in the different communities, who hauled the stone, putting the big stone at the bottom and the smaller sizes on the top. We knew then how to make public roads. We did not require an expenditure of \$60,000 to show my community how to build a pike that has lasted for 115 or 120 years, and practically without repair.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman knows there were some roads built in ancient times such as the Appian Way and the roads built by Caesar that have lasted for 2,000 years and more.

Mr. BUTLER. So has the road I speak of. It was built to stay. I only give this to the Chairman to illustrate that when men see fit to apply the good sense which nature has given

them they can do those things largely themselves, and do not need \$60,000 to spend in messengers, clerks, and charwomen hire.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman—I happen to know about the pike the gentleman speaks of because I have been over it—but what about his dirt roads?

Mr. BUTLER. The mud roads are bad roads. We are against mud roads. We can not do everything, however, at one time.

Mr. GOULDEN. You have got them.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; but I will say to my friend that we have got so much taxes in our county that we have to lower the rate of taxation. We have so much money in the treasury that we do not know what to do with it.

Mr. GOOD. Give it to Secretary McAdoo. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. We will make our own roads in our own fashion. They will be good roads, and they will not cost the Government a penny.

Mr. GOULDEN. I suggest you had better begin soon. They are bad roads. You need scientific engineers to show you how to build them.

Mr. BUTLER. If the engineer comes, we would have no money left. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOULDEN. You do not spend your money aright.

Mr. BUTLER. We will not give the money to the engineers. We will put it on the roads. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice; the different kinds of power and appliances, and the development of equipment for farm irrigation; the flow of water in ditches, pipes, and other conduits; the duty, apportionment, and measurement of irrigation water; the customs, regulations, and laws affecting irrigation; for the purchase and installation of equipment for experimental purposes; for the giving of expert advice and assistance; for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation; for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside of the District of Columbia; and for supplies and all necessary expenses, \$106,400.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by adding a new paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 68, by adding, after line 25, a new paragraph, as follows:

"For investigating and reporting upon the cost and feasibility of pumping from wells for the irrigation of lands in southwestern Nebraska; for preparing plans for the impounding of waters that now go to waste in water courses leading into streams in southwestern Nebraska; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of wells for irrigation for the purchase of materials and equipment; and for preparing and illustrating reports and bulletins on subirrigation and for demonstration purposes, \$100,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order now, although it seems to me that if the point of order would lie against this amendment it certainly would lie against the paragraph that has just been read and the one following.

On examining the provisions of this bill, Mr. Chairman, we find appropriations made for draining swamp lands and also for irrigating lands that have no water at all. We have in my part of the country a condition of semiarid lands. If we can get water on that land once a year, we could then produce bountiful crops. A survey has been made by the Government, proving that there is an inexhaustible supply of water close to the surface, but we have never been fortunate enough to get the assistance of the Government in that part of the country to develop our resources. There are possibilities of making this section one of the finest agricultural countries in the world. A bulletin has been issued by the Department of Agriculture giving experiments on 18 different wells in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas—wells used for pumping water for the irrigation of rice fields. I will insert in the RECORD their experiments or investigations. These wells range from 150 feet to 300 feet deep. They are proven to be practicable.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BARTON. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Are these wells to which the gentleman refers operated by the Government of the United States or by the people of the localities?

Mr. BARTON. In only one instance, I think, the State of Arkansas and the Government of the United States cooperated in building one well and operating it.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there any reason why the people of Nebraska could not dig these wells for themselves?

Mr. BARTON. Not at all. If the gentleman had examined my amendment he would find that we do not ask the Government to do it. We simply ask the Government to do what it has already done in other parts of the country and is providing for all through this bill—to investigate the feasibility of the proposition.

Mr. BAILEY. Is there any reason why they should not investigate that themselves?

Mr. BARTON. No more reason than that the people of the South, who will receive the benefit of many provisions in this bill, should do those things themselves; no more than that a State should take care of its own rivers, or should take care of its own rural carriers, or should take care of its own roads, and do for itself a lot of other things such as run through this bill; for example, the reclamation of swamp lands and the irrigation of arid lands.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BARTON. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that if he and any of his friends will come down to the Staked Plains in Texas they will find large wells that have been put in there, and you will find all the authority you want there as to the best means and appliances for pumping water, for pumps, engines, and everything connected with doing this irrigation work, without any experimentation or the spending of a cent. We will be glad if the gentleman will come down there and buy some of those irrigated lands. They will be sold cheap.

Mr. BARTON. We could go into areas in Illinois where they have drained their swamp lands, and in Iowa, where I am personally acquainted, where they have tilled their land, but why ask us to do different than other sections of this country? Other sections of this bill provide that people of other States may be very much benefited by Government assistance. Why deprive us of the same privilege? Swamp lands are not in existence in that part of the country. Neither is it arid. It is a semiarid region, and we are asking for this help from the Government that the people as a whole may be benefited. I ask gentlemen of the House to give us more than ordinary consideration. I ask for only \$100,000 for this experiment. We are appropriating much more for nearly every other experiment that is provided for under this bill. I believe we are entitled to advice. We are asking not for money to dig wells, not money to turn the water on the land, or anything of that character, but to enable us to have it demonstrated to us that this project is feasible and that it can be done.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I will insert the following as a part of my remarks:

The United States Department of Agriculture issued October 30, 1908, a pamphlet giving the cost of pumping from wells in Louisiana and Arkansas, and I will insert at this point a description of some of the plants and the results of tests:

#### DESCRIPTION OF PLANTS AND RESULTS OF TESTS.

In general, the tabulated results are self-explanatory. The attempt is made to bring out the facts of greatest interest to the owners of pumping plants, and especially the cost of pumping. Measurements covering several years show that the average quantity of water used on rice is about 15 inches in depth over the land during the growth of a crop, and this depth has been used in computing the cost of pumping per acre irrigated. No data showing the cost of attendance and other labor employed in pumping were collected. This is considerable, as the plants are operated night and day for 60 to 100 days each year, taking practically all of the time of two men, who receive from \$1.50 to \$2 per day. This makes an average cost of perhaps \$3.50 per day for attendance. Assuming an average season of 80 days makes this cost \$280 for each plant. In each case this sum is divided by the number of acres, to secure the cost of attendance per acre.

Interest is assumed at 7 per cent, and depreciation at 10 per cent of the first cost. Interest, depreciation, attendance, and fuel cost for 1.25 acre-feet, or 15 acre-inches, are added to secure the annual cost of pumped water per acre irrigated.

#### PLANT NO. 1.

The plant of Mr. H. E. Wesson, located about one-half mile northeast of the railway station at Welsh, La., was tested on June 17, 1907. This same plant was tested in 1905. The engine and boiler used at that time were still in use in 1907, but the well and pump had been

changed. The new well is 335 feet deep; it has a 10-inch casing with 80 feet of strainer, consisting of wire of trapezoidal cross section wound over a pipe through which numerous holes had been drilled. The new pump is a No. 6 compound vertical centrifugal. It was driven by a quarter-twist belt. The engine flywheel is 60 inches in diameter, and the pulley on the pump 18 inches in diameter. This pump is peculiar in that no pit is required except the steel casing above and fastened to the pump, of the same diameter as the largest diameter of the pump. A hole of the proper diameter is bored into the ground to a depth sufficient to submerge the impellers of the pump. This hole is approximately three times the diameter of the casing below. With this type of pump alignment of shaft is insured. The pump was placed 40 feet below the surface.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, having seventy-two 2-inch flues 9 feet long, and has a capacity, according to the builders' rating, of 50 horsepower.

The engine is a simple noncondensing slide valve, and has a cylinder 12 inches in diameter and stroke of 15 inches. There is a feed-water heater in the base of the engine. The boiler was fed by a pump. The feed water used during the test was weighed.

The fuel used was crude oil, costing \$1.40 per barrel of 42 gallons at the plant. During the test it was measured in an elevated tank by noting the fall of level. The specific gravity was determined by means of a hydrometer.

The cost of this plant was as follows:

Engine, boiler, and shed	\$1,175
Belt	50
Well, pump, and derrick, including steel pit	2,074
Total	3,299

The plant was in fairly good condition, as the engine had received a general overhauling and had been placed on a new foundation.

The water pumped was measured by means of a weir 36½ inches in width, with end contractions suppressed; the depth over the crest of the weir was measured by means of a hook gauge.

It was impossible to measure the depth of water in the well even when the pump was not running; however, there was an old well about 75 yards away in which the depth could be measured. The water in the old well and in the new one was known from previous observations to be at the same level.

As already stated, the useful work credited to the pump was computed on the basis of the height from the level of water in the well when the pump was not running to the level at which it was discharged. It must be remembered that the true head was greater than the head used. The water in this well is lowered when the pump is started, and there is a loss of head in passing through the screen and some loss in the suction pipe below the pump. The only way the true head can be known is by attaching a vacuum gauge to the suction pipe underneath the pumps, and this was impossible. The efficiency given might be termed the efficiency of engine, pump, and well, charging the lowering of the water and loss in the screen to the well.

There was a comparatively small amount of heat added to the water at the feed-water heater, because the steam merely enters the heater and emerges from the point of entry. This arrangement could be improved by having the exhaust pipe taken out at a point which would compel the steam to travel along the outside of the pipes containing water in the heater.

#### Results of test of plant No. 1.

Duration of test, hours	4.67
Lift, feet	11.60
Average indicated horsepower	42.3
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.21
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,444
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.285
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	207
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	4.89
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	781.1
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	67.3
Cost of fuel per barrel	\$1.40
Cost of fuel per hour	\$0.906
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	\$0.0214
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	\$3.42
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	\$0.294
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	10

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	\$3,299
---------------	---------

#### PLANT NO. 2.

The well-pumping plant of Mr. John H. Armstrong, located about 3 miles southeast of Welsh, La., was tested on June 18, 1907. It was used to water 140 acres during the season of 1907.

The well is 9½ inches in diameter and 305 feet deep. The pit is 35 feet deep, and there are 82 feet of sawed strainer (fig. 2).

The pump used is a No. 6 vertical-shaft centrifugal with a 14-inch pulley.

The engine is a slide-valve; diameter of cylinder, 9½ inches; stroke, 12 inches; diameter of rod, 1½ inches. The exhaust of the engine passed through a closed heater to the smokestack. The flywheel of the engine to which the pump is belted is 40 inches in diameter.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, with 52 tubes 12 feet in length and 3 inches in diameter. The builders' rating of boiler is 60 horsepower. A feed-water heater utilized a part of the heat of the exhaust steam that otherwise would have been thrown away. A small, direct-acting steam pump is used to feed the boiler. The mean temperature of water coming from the well was 80° F., while the mean temperature of the water after passing through the heater was 188.5° F. The saving of fuel by the use of the heater in this case was 9.5 per cent.

The importance of a heater in a small pumping plant is too often overlooked. An inexpensive one can be made of pipe fittings; in the average case a heater will save about 10 per cent of the fuel, and at the present prices for fuel so large a saving is well worth while. Feed water was measured during the test by weighing.

Indicator cards and general observations were taken every half hour. Coal was carefully weighed and the time noted for using each 100 pounds. The fuel used was bituminous coal, costing \$5.70 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant.

The discharge was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume built in the discharge ditch for that purpose.

The height through which the water was raised was measured in an abandoned well near the one in use, as in the case of the test plant No. 1. The height from water surface to level of discharge was the head used in computing useful water horsepower.



The cost of this plant, complete, including engine, boiler, belts, foundations, heater, and feed pump, well pump, pit, well, lumber, strainer pipe, and shed, was \$2,668.

Some trouble was encountered because of the slipping of the cotton belt, and during the test the belt lacing broke and had to be repaired. Otherwise the test was entirely satisfactory.

The pump is provided with an appliance for maintaining alignment of shaft. Briefly, it consists of special pipe fittings by means of which the discharge pipe of the vertical-shaft centrifugal pump is brought over near the shaft and then carried up parallel to the shaft. The pipe is screwed home very solidly into the fittings so that it is rigid. Special bearings for the shaft are then clamped to the pipe. Any settling of the pump or change of position results in a corresponding change in the discharge pipe and shaft, so that the alignment is maintained.

The results of the test follow:

#### Results of test of plant No. 2.

Duration of test, hours.....	4
Lift, feet.....	17.5
Average indicated horsepower.....	48.95
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second.....	4.55
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute.....	2,050
Average discharge of pump, acre-foot per hour.....	0.376
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds.....	212.5
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds.....	4.34
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds.....	565.2
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds.....	32.3
Cost of fuel per ton.....	\$5.70
Cost of fuel per hour.....	\$0.608
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour.....	\$0.0124
Cost of fuel per acre-foot.....	\$1.62
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot.....	\$0.092
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent.....	19.2

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant.....	\$2,668
Area irrigated, acres.....	140
Cost of plant per acre irrigated.....	\$19.06

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent.....	\$1.33
Depreciation, 10 per cent on first cost.....	1.91
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet.....	2.03
Attendance.....	2.00

Total annual cost per acre irrigated..... 7.27

#### PLANT NO. 3.

The pumping plant owned by Mr. M. A. Neely and located about 4 miles north of Welsh, La., was tested on June 20, 1907. During the season of 1907 about 300 acres of rice was irrigated.

The engine is a simple, noncondensing, slide-valve, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of cylinder, 11 inches; stroke, 14 inches; diameter of rod, 1½ inches. From the flywheel of the engine power is transmitted to the pump by means of a rope drive consisting of four strands of 1½-inch manila rope. The driving sheave on the engine is 69 inches in diameter and that on the pump 21 inches in diameter.

The pump is a vertical-shaft centrifugal, in a pit about 30 feet deep. The well has a depth of 325 feet; 80 feet of strainer is used. It is of the usual type made by drilling holes in the casing and then wrapping it with wire.

The boiler is a horizontal, return tubular, rated by the builders at 50 horsepower.

The fuel used was crude oil from the Jennings field, costing \$1.40 per barrel at the plant. During the test the height of oil in a cylindrical tank was noted and at the end of the test the same level was restored by adding a weighed quantity of oil to the tank.

Feed water is forced through a heater by the steam pump used to feed the boiler.

The water discharged by the pump was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume leading from the pond in which the pump discharged to the small canal used to convey the water to the field.

Indicator cards and other observations were taken at half-hour intervals; the duration of the test was four hours. The level of the water in the discharge pipe could be observed when the pump was not running by letting down a lantern. The distance from this level to the point to which the water was discharged was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower and efficiency.

The cost of the entire outfit, including boiler, engine, pump, well, belt, and shed, was \$2,200.

The results of the test follow:

#### Result of test of plant No. 3.

Duration of test, hours.....	4
Lift, feet.....	23.86
Average indicated horsepower.....	53.7
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second.....	4.34
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute.....	1,953
Average discharge of pump, acre-foot per hour.....	0.359
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds.....	191.8
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds.....	3.57
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds.....	531.5
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds.....	22.3
Cost of fuel per barrel.....	\$1.40
Cost of fuel per hour.....	\$0.84
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour.....	\$0.0157
Cost of fuel per acre-foot.....	\$2.34
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot.....	\$0.098
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent.....	21.8

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant.....	\$2,200
Area irrigated, acres.....	300
Cost of plant per acre irrigated.....	\$7.33

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent.....	\$0.51
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost.....	.73
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet.....	2.93
Attendance.....	.93

Total annual cost per acre irrigated..... 5.10

#### PLANT NO. 4.

The plant owned by Mr. L. E. Robinson, located about 7 miles northeast of Welsh, La., was tested on June 22, 1907. It was a new outfit, used for the first time during the season of 1907, when about 230 acres was watered.

The plant is equipped with a heavy-duty, noncondensing slide-valve engine, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of cylinder 12½ inches, stroke 20 inches, diameter of rod 1½ inches. The flywheel is 60 inches in diameter; a quarter-turn belt is used to transmit power from the engine to a No. 10 centrifugal pump, similar to that described in test No. 1, having a discharge pipe 12 inches in diameter. The well has a casing 18 inches in diameter, is 320 feet deep, and has 105 feet of strainer. The pit is 50 feet deep.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, with 79 3-inch tubes 13 feet long.

Fuel oil was used. It was stored in a vertical cylindrical tank. The distance from the rim of the tank to the surface of the oil was observed every hour, and the weight of oil computed from these readings and the specific gravity. As the oil used during the test had been placed in the tank from which it was fed by gravity to the burner only a short time previous to the test, it is probable that some water was still mixed with it, as sufficient time had not been allowed for it to settle. The exhaust pipe of the small steam pump used to feed the boiler was run through the fuel-oil tank and by this means the temperature of the oil was raised to 103° F.

The discharge of the pump was measured by placing a plank, beveled on the downstream side and with a sharp corner on the upstream side, across the flume below the pump, to act as the sill of a weir without end contractions. There was quite a large velocity of approach which was taken into account in computing the quantity of water. A hook gauge was used to measure the depth of water over the sill of the weir.

The water fed to the boiler was carefully measured by means of a calibrated barrel, which was filled by means of a hand pump and then allowed to empty into a barrel below, from which it was pumped to the boiler. There was a heater in which the water had its temperature raised from about 75° F. to 175° F.

During the test readings of the hook gauge were taken every 15 minutes; indicator cards and general observations were taken every half hour. The quantity of oil used was measured every hour.

The level of the water in the well was found by means of a steel tape let down into the discharge pipe. Before the test was started the observed depth was 26.5 feet below the level of discharge, while at the end it had increased to 27.5 feet; the mean of the two was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower.

The cost of the outfit was as follows:

Engine and boiler, feed pump, piping, etc.....	\$1,500
Well, pit, and pump, set up.....	2,304
Shed.....	600

Total..... 4,404

The results of the test follow:

#### Results of test of plant No. 4.

Duration of test, hours.....	4
Lift, feet.....	27
Average indicated horsepower.....	47.2
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second.....	2.78
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute.....	1,251
Average discharge of pump, acre-foot per hour.....	0.231
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds.....	240.8
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds.....	5.10
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds.....	1,042.4
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds.....	38.6
Cost of fuel per barrel.....	\$1.05
Cost of fuel per hour.....	\$0.79
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour.....	\$0.0168
Cost of fuel per acre-foot.....	\$3.43
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot.....	\$0.127
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent.....	18.4

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant.....	\$4,404
Area irrigated, acres.....	230
Cost of plant per acre irrigated.....	\$19.15

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent.....	\$1.34
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost.....	1.92
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet.....	4.25
Attendance.....	1.22

Total annual cost per acre irrigated..... 8.73

#### PLANT NO. 5.

The pumping plant of Mr. W. S. Robertson, located about 2 miles east of the town of Iota, La., was tested on June 26, 1907. This plant watered 175 acres of rice during the season of 1907.

The plant is equipped as follows: There is a simple, slide-valve, noncondensing engine, with diameter of cylinder 10 inches, length of stroke 12 inches, and diameter of rod 1½ inches. The engine is direct connected to a rotary pump having a capacity of 13.6 gallons per revolution. The engine and pump are placed in a pit about 10 feet deep. The pump has its suction side connected to two 10-inch wells, each 200 feet deep and about 40 feet apart. The pump is between the two wells, about 20 feet from each. The discharge pipe of the pump is 12 inches in diameter. The suction pipes are provided with wire-gauze strainers of unknown length. The plant has been operated for five years.

The boiler used is of the locomotive type, rated by its builders at 25 horsepower. Water is fed to the boiler by means of an injector.

The fuel ordinarily used is coal and wood. The cost of the former is \$6.35 per ton and of the latter \$2.25 per cord at the plant. During the test coal only was used, so that the measurement of fuel could be made more definitely. Coal was weighed up in quantities of 40 pounds and the time noted when each charge was fired.

The water pumped was measured in a small flume by means of a current meter.

Indicator cards, readings of steam pressure, temperature, and observations with the current meter were taken at half-hour intervals.

The true head pumped against was determined in this case by placing a vacuum gauge on the suction pipe. Measuring the head from the point where the gauge was attached to the level of discharge and

adding it to the vacuum expressed in feet of water gave the head against which the pump was actually operating.

It was impossible to directly measure the depth of water in the well, as the tees at the top of the well casing into which was screwed the pipe leading from the well casing to the pump were both several feet under ground. Previous to 1907 the pump and engine had been at the surface of the ground. The flanges forming covers for the top of the tees had often been taken off the tees and the depth measured and compared to the depth observed by neighbors in the discharge pipes of centrifugal pumps at a distance of a mile or two from the wells tested, and it was found that they always agreed within a few inches. At the time the test was made the level of water in the same neighbors' wells was known to be about 20 feet from the surface, and therefore that head was used as the basis for computing useful water horsepower, in order that a comparison could be had between the centrifugal pumps and the rotary. By consulting the summary of results it will be seen that the efficiency on the same basis as that used for all other pumps is 50 per cent better than the best one of any other class. This accords with the efficiencies found for large pumps of this type. By consulting the table showing the cost of pumping it will be seen that this plant made a good showing in comparison with others as to fuel economy. A feed-water heater would reduce the fuel bill by about 10 per cent and ought to be added to the equipment of this plant.

The total cost of this plant complete, including boiler, engine, pump, wells, piping, etc., was \$3,300.

#### Results of test of plant No. 5.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	33.25
Average indicated horsepower	21.9
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.19
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,436
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.265
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	120
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	5.48
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	452.8
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	13.62
Cost of fuel per ton	\$6.25
Cost of fuel per hour	\$0.376
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	\$0.0172
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	\$1.42
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	\$0.071
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent (with the lift estimated at 20 feet, to correspond with other plants, the efficiency is 33.4 per cent)	55

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	\$3,300
Area irrigated, acres	175
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	\$18.86

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	\$1.32
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.89
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	1.78
Attendance	1.60

Total annual cost per acre irrigated 6.59

#### PLANT NO. 6.

The plant owned by Mr. Henry Schambaugh, located near the town of Iota, La., about a mile distant from the plant described as plant No. 5, was tested on June 27, 1907. One hundred and forty acres of rice was watered in 1907.

The engine is a noncondensing slide-valve, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of cylinder, 11 inches; stroke, 13 inches; diameter of rod, 1½ inches. The flywheel, 50 inches in diameter, drives a vertical shaft centrifugal pump by means of a quarter-twist belt. The diameter of the pulley on the pump is 14 inches.

The boiler is of the locomotive type, having 54 tubes 2½ inches in diameter by 8 feet 3 inches long, rated by its builders at 40 horsepower. It is well lagged with sheet metal arranged to leave a space over the surface which is filled with charcoal.

A pump is used to feed the boiler. The feed water is forced through a heater in the engine base, into which the engine exhausts. In this way the feed is heated from an average temperature of 84° F. to 147° F.

The fuel used was crude oil, costing \$1.40 per barrel of 42 gallons at the plant.

The pump is a No. 6 vertical shaft centrifugal, having suction and discharge pipes each 10 inches in diameter. The well is 315 feet deep and the pit 38 feet deep. Both sawed and wire-wound screens were used in the 60 feet of strainer.

The water pumped was measured by means of a current meter in a flume about one-fourth mile distant from the pumping plant. Although the test lasted for four hours, the water measurement was taken only during the last two hours.

Fuel oil was measured at half-hour intervals by the drop in level in a vertical cylindrical tank from which the burner is fed by gravity.

Indicator cards, readings of current meter, and the other observations were taken at intervals of a half hour.

The distance between the water level when the pump was still and the level of discharge was measured by means of a steel tape in the discharge pipe of the pump. This height was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower and efficiency. The pump had been running for some time and was stopped only long enough to make the measurement.

The cost of the entire plant was \$2,500.

#### Results of test of plant No. 6.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	21
Average indicated horsepower	38.6
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.30
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,485
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.274
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	133.3
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	3.45
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	486.5
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	23.17
Cost of fuel per barrel	\$1.40
Cost of fuel per hour	\$0.585
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	\$0.0152
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	\$2.14
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	\$0.102
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	20.3

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	\$2,500
Area irrigated, acres	140
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	\$17.86

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost, at 7 per cent	\$1.25
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.79
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.68
Attendance	2.00

Total annual cost per acre irrigated 7.72

#### PLANT NO. 7.

The plant owned by Mr. T. J. Curtis, tested on July 9, 1907, is located about 3 miles northwest from Gueydan, La. During the season of 1907 about 165 acres of rice was watered.

The engine is a slide-valve, noncondensing, with dimensions as follows: Diameter of piston, 11 inches; stroke, 14 inches; diameter of rod, 1½ inches.

The boiler is of the locomotive type and contains forty-eight 3-inch flues 11 feet 9 inches long. The length of boiler over all is 18 feet and the diameter of the front portion 45 inches. The builders' rating is 50 horsepower.

The pump is a vertical-shaft centrifugal, with a 6-inch discharge pipe. A quarter-twist belt from the engine flywheel drives the pump.

The well is 10 inches in diameter and 238 feet deep, with 80 feet of wire-wound screen. Of this, 60 feet is wound with galvanized and 20 feet with copper wire.

The fuel used was coal, costing \$6.75 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant.

An injector is used to feed the boiler. There was no feed-water heater. The feed water was measured in a calibrated barrel.

The discharge was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume. Readings were taken at half-hour intervals.

Coal was weighed out in 30-pound quantities and the time of firing each charge was noted.

Indicator cards and other readings were taken at half-hour intervals.

The cost of the outfit is given in detail in the following statement:

Engine, boiler, and pump	\$1,562.00
Well, 238 feet deep, at \$3	714.00
Strainer	80.00
Lumber for pit	16.00
Digging pit	16.00
3 hoops for pit	9.00
160 feet lumber for pump frame	3.20
Cost of setting pump	12.50
Cost of unloading boiler from car	5.00
Hauling pump, boiler, and engine	14.00
3,000 brick	30.00
3 barrels cement	12.00
Labor for setting engine	50.00

Total 2,523.70

When the pump was idle for some time the level of the water was only 7.81 feet below the height to which it was elevated when the pump was running. Water stands quite near the surface in the Gueydan district, as it is much nearer the Gulf of Mexico than the wells previously tested, and the level of the ground surface is lower than it is farther north. At first glance it would seem as though the pumping of water in this territory would be much less expensive than in sections where the distance from water surface to ground level is much greater. The advantage, however, is lost when the wells are pumped to nearly their full capacity. The hydraulic gradient in the immediate vicinity of the well falls from this cause as well as from the loss of head in flowing through the gravel, so that the original height as observed may be only a small portion of the total head when the pump is running at full capacity, and therefore the head as observed and used in these tests may be only a small part of the total head.

#### Results of test of plant No. 7.

Duration of test, hours	4
Lift, feet	7.81
Average indicated horsepower	32
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	3.77
Average discharge of pump, gallons per minute	1,695
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.313
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	172.5
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	5.39
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	551.1
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	70.6
Cost of fuel per ton	\$6.75
Cost of fuel per hour	\$0.583
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	\$0.0182
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	\$1.87
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	\$0.24
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	10.5

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	\$2,524
Area irrigated, acres	165
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	\$15.30

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost, at 7 per cent	\$1.07
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.53
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.34
Attendance	1.71

Total annual cost per acre irrigated 6.65

#### PLANT NO. 8.

On July 10, 1907, a test was made of the pumping plant of Mr. J. W. Gardiner, located about 3 miles south of Gueydan, La. It furnished water to irrigate 200 acres of rice in 1907.

The equipment of this plant was as follows: A slide-valve, noncondensing engine; size of cylinder 14 by 20 inches with piston rod 1½ inches in diameter.

The engine is belted to a jack shaft about 25 feet long, from which power is transmitted by quarter-twist belts to two vertical shaft No. 6 centrifugal pumps, one for each of the two wells. The depth of wells is 230 and 233 feet, and the diameter of the casing in each case 10 inches, with 60 feet of wire-wound strainers at the lower end. The wells are 100 feet apart. The pits were comparatively shallow, only about 20 feet deep.



The boiler is of the locomotive type, having a length of 18 feet and a diameter of 54 inches. There are seventy-six 3-inch flues 13 feet in length.

Feed water is pumped into the boiler direct by means of a small steam pump; the mean temperature was 73° F. During the test it was impossible to measure the feed water, and as the plant was in bad condition it was not of much importance that the feed be measured. There were several leaks about the ends of tubes from which the water was running in little streams into the fire box. There were also several leaks in the steam main and the engine was in need of adjustment. A leak in the suction pipe of one of the pumps necessitated the flooding of the pit and doubtless reduced efficiency to some extent.

It was intended to run the test for four hours, but at the end of two hours the main belt broke, necessitating a shutdown for about a half hour, so the test was concluded at the end of the two-hour period.

The fuel used was Pittsburgh bituminous coal, costing \$7 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant. The coal was carefully weighed during this time. The revolutions per minute of engine and one of the pumps were observed. As the pulleys on the jack shaft and pump were the same in both cases the revolutions of the pump, neglecting slip, were identical.

The discharge from both pumps was measured by means of a current meter in a small flume.

The test was in every way satisfactory. However, it is probable that observations as to the fuel used for a longer period of time would have given a slightly more reliable result, but, considering the condition of the plant, further efforts in this direction were unwarranted.

Again, as in the case of test No. 7, the water was near the surface, so that the height through which the water had to be elevated was only 6.27 feet. The plant had been in operation several days and was stopped to measure the head. The remarks made in the case of the previous test apply equally well in this one.

The following is a detailed statement of the cost of this outfit:

Cost of wells and pits	\$1,700
2 Kingsford pumps, at \$200 each	400
Engine and boiler (second hand)	1,000
Shed	250
Belting	150
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,500</b>

When purchased the engine and boiler had been used but were almost new and were bought at a bargain. The shed was unusually large and contained more material than was necessary. The cost of belting was excessive because of the arrangement of the plant, one main belt being required between engine and jack shaft and two more between jack shafts and pumps.

#### Results of test of plant No. 8.

Duration of test, hours	2
Lift, feet	6.27
Average indicated horsepower	57.79
Average discharge of pumps, cubic feet per second	6.38
Average discharge of pumps, gallons per minute	2,878
Average discharge of pumps, acre-feet per hour	0.53
Fuel consumed per hour, pounds	403
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour, pounds	7
Fuel consumed per acre-foot, pounds	760.4
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot, pounds	112.7
Cost of fuel per ton	\$7.00
Cost of fuel per hour	\$1.413
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	\$0.0244
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	\$2.68
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	\$0.428
Efficiency of engine, pumps, and well, per cent	7.9
<b>COST OF WATER.</b>	
Cost of plant	\$3,500
Area irrigated, acres	200
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	\$17.50
<b>ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.</b>	
Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	\$1.23
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	1.75
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	3.35
Attendance	1.40
<b>Total annual cost per acre irrigated</b>	<b>7.73</b>

#### PLANT NO. 9.

This plant is located about 1½ miles west of Lonoke, Ark., at the State Agricultural Experiment Station. The plant was installed in 1904 by the State of Arkansas in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. During the season of 1907 45 acres was watered.

A noncondensing slide-valve engine is used, having a diameter of cylinder 8 inches and diameter of rod 1½ inches and stroke 13 inches.

By means of a quarter-twist cotton belt the engine drives a vertical-shaft centrifugal pump placed in a pit 30 feet deep. The well is 100 feet deep with casing and 30 feet of copper-gauze strainer. The engine flywheel is used as a pulley. It is 54 inches in diameter, while the pump pulley is 14 inches in diameter.

The boiler is of the self-contained, horizontal, return-tubular type, shell 10 by 2 feet, 10½ inches. There are 26 3-inch tubes. The setting is built of bricks and the plant is in fairly good condition.

An injector is used to feed the boiler; there is no heater. The test lasted for four hours; the conditions were fairly regular.

Coal was weighed in quantities of 45 pounds, and the time of firing each charge noted. Indicator cards and general observations were taken at half-hour intervals. The quantity of water fed to the boiler was carefully weighed.

The water pumped was measured by means of a permanent 12-inch Cipolletti weir. The height of water over the crest was measured by means of a hook gauge.

The level of the water in the pit was known to be the same as that in the discharge of the pump when the pump was idle. The height of the discharge from that level was used as the head in computing useful water horsepower and efficiency, as was done in the plants tested in Louisiana. On this basis the head was 27.6 feet.

The fuel used was bituminous coal, costing \$3.40 per ton at the plant.

The cost of the entire plant, including machinery, shed, and well, was \$1,800.

#### Results of test of plant No. 9.

Duration of test	hours	4
Lift	feet	27.6
Average indicated horsepower		17.2
Average discharge of pump	cubic feet per second	1.10
Average discharge of pump	gallons per minute	495
Average discharge of pump	acre-feet per hour	0.0913
Fuel consumed per hour	pounds	123.8
Fuel consumed per indicated horsepower hour	do	7.2
Fuel consumed per acre-foot	do	135.6
Fuel consumed per foot-acre-foot	do	49.1
Cost of fuel per ton	do	\$3.40
Cost of fuel per hour	do	\$0.211
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	do	\$0.0123
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	do	\$2.32
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	do	\$0.0842
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well	per cent	20

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	\$1,800
Area irrigated	45
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	\$40

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost, at 7 per cent	\$2.80
Depreciation, 10 per cent of first cost	4.00
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.90
Attendance	6.22

**Total annual cost per acre irrigated** 15.92

#### PLANT NO. 10.

On August 20, 1907, the well pumping plant belonging to Mr. W. H. Hicks, located about 5 miles southeast of Lonoke, Ark., was tested. Ninety-two acres of rice was watered during the season of 1907.

The well is 168 feet deep; the casing is 10 inches in diameter and has 70 feet of sawed strainer. The pump is a No. 6 vertical-shaft centrifugal, placed in a pit 40 feet deep.

The engine has a 10-inch cylinder with a 12-inch stroke; diameter of rod, 1½ inches.

The boiler is a horizontal return-tubular, 14 feet long by 44 inches in diameter, having 28 3-inch tubes. The setting is of brick. The furnace was in bad condition, due to cracks in the front of the setting, causing several large leaks. An injector was used to feed the boiler; there was no feed-water heater.

The fuel used was wood, costing \$1.50 per cord, and bituminous coal, costing \$4 per ton of 2,000 pounds at the plant.

The water pumped was measured by means of a portable 18-inch Cipolletti weir placed in the discharge ditch.

During the test the water used was carefully weighed, as was also the coal. The wood used was measured. General observations as noted in the log were taken at half-hour intervals. The test lasted for 2½ hours. All the conditions were uniform and the results entirely satisfactory.

The height through which the water was elevated was measured, as in the other tests, by means of a steel tape in the discharge pipe of the pump. It was 35.8 feet. The plant had been running for several days, and was stopped only long enough to measure the head.

This plant could cut down fuel expense 10 per cent by installing a heater. The mean temperature of feed was only 60.5° F. A heater could be employed to raise the temperature over 100°, and not only effect a saving in fuel but also prolong the life of the boiler by avoiding stresses due to wide variations in the temperature of the water in its different parts.

The total cost of this plant was as follows:

Well, pit, and pump	\$1,000
Engine and boiler	1,100
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,100</b>

#### Results of test of plant No. 10.

Duration of test, hours	3
Lift, feet	35.8
Average indicated horsepower	41.7
Average discharge of pump, cubic feet per second	1.64
Average discharge of pump, gallons, per minute	738
Average discharge of pump, acre-feet per hour	0.136
Cost of fuel	
Coal, per ton	\$4.00
Wood, per cord	\$1.50
Cost of fuel per hour	\$0.312
Cost of fuel per indicated horsepower hour	\$0.0075
Cost of fuel per acre-foot	\$2.30
Cost of fuel per foot-acre-foot	\$0.0642
Efficiency of engine, pump, and well, per cent	16.1

#### COST OF WATER.

Cost of plant	\$2,100
Area, irrigated, acres	92
Cost of plant per acre irrigated	\$22.82

#### ANNUAL COST PER ACRE.

Interest on first cost at 7 per cent	\$1.60
Depreciation, 10 per cent on first cost	2.28
Fuel cost of 1.25 acre-feet	2.88
Attendance	3.04

**Total annual cost per acre irrigated** 9.80

I could insert the other tests made, but I feel that enough proof has been marshaled to convince this body that irrigation by wells is practical.

A survey has been completed of southwestern Nebraska, which proves that the supply of water a few feet under the surface is practically inexhaustible.

We know that damming of the watercourses leading into the streams must prove of benefit in bringing more rains, and as the representative of this part of our country I plead with you to give us this appropriation, so that men that we help pay, will devote a portion of their time to our interests. On page 75

of this bill you have made special provision for the Louisiana farmer, as we did in the last Agricultural bill. All through the bill runs legislation that will specially assist favored communities. I know from living in Nebraska a lifetime that you could not come to the assistance of a people who are more worthy than the farmers of southwest Nebraska, who have for years watched their crops dry, wither, and blow away; then with indomitable courage tackle the job again and again. We are just asking our rights, and I ask you in the interests of economy and right, to buy \$100,000 less powder, shot, and shell, and come to the rescue of the farmers of southwest Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I wanted to suggest to the gentleman that the appropriation made in this paragraph was for investigating the very subject to which his amendment applies. I did not catch directly the reading of his amendment. It says:

For investigating and reporting upon the cost and feasibility of pumping from wells or the irrigation of lands in southwestern Nebraska; for preparing plans for the impounding of waters that now go to waste in watercourses leading into streams in southwestern Nebraska; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of wells for irrigation; for the purchase of materials and equipment—

And so forth.

Here is \$106,000 appropriated, which applies anywhere in the country where these investigations may need to be made or can be made.

Why can not part of this appropriation be applied to the very purpose that the gentleman from Nebraska is asking for, to come in with all the balance of us?

Mr. BARTON. I am inclined to think, after reading this paragraph, that it would not apply to the damming of watercourses or the holding of water just as a sort of surplus and for experimenting on subirrigation.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is wrong. Although the department is not doing the character of work specified by the gentleman from South Carolina, I am satisfied that the language is broad enough to permit the department to do it.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. It strikes me that the language is broad enough to permit the department to do exactly what the gentleman's amendment intends they shall do, and that he can take his chances on the \$106,000 that is appropriated in this paragraph.

Mr. BARTON. I trust I shall be fortunate enough to have the chairman of the committee and the gentleman now addressing the committee use their good influences to have this paragraph applied to southwestern Nebraska; and if they do, I shall have no objection to having the amendment voted down, as I know it will be.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like some light from the chairman of the committee, if the statement he has just made is correct, as to why it is that he raises a point of order on the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I reserved a point of order simply because I could not hear the amendment as it was read. I do not think it is subject to a point of order, in all probability, and I am going to withdraw the point of order and let the House vote on the proposition.

Mr. MARTIN. While I am on my feet I should like to ask the chairman upon what theory this work is put under the Department of Good Roads, or Public Roads?

Mr. LEVER. The only engineering corps in the department at all has been carried in the Office of Public Roads, except the engineers provided for in the items for irrigation and drainage. Those two items have been carried as miscellaneous items in the Office of Experiment Stations. They require engineers to do that kind of work. The Secretary of Agriculture thought it was better to concentrate all the engineering activities, both for roads and rural engineering, in one bureau, and we agreed to it.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course the gentleman is aware that the Government is maintaining a very large corps of engineers in the Reclamation Service under the particular work of hydraulic engineering.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will notice that we have confined our work to the irrigation work in connection with agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. Practically all the irrigation work that the Reclamation Service is doing is in connection with agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. This has to do more largely with the country outside of the arid region.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is now for the first time putting these two classes of engineering work in connection with

water as applied to farming under the particular Bureau of Good Roads.

Mr. LEVER. Heretofore they have been carried under the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. MARTIN. Of course they have no logical connection with the Office of Good Roads.

Mr. LEVER. They have no connection whatever with the Office of Experiment Stations.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the gentleman think this is only another way of building up and giving dignity and larger scope and jurisdiction to a bureau which we will be called upon to appropriate more and more for as we go on?

Mr. LEVER. I tried to point out a moment ago to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the name of the office has been changed, so as to indicate the character of the work that is being done. It is now designated the Office of Roads and Rural Engineering. Formerly it was the Office of Roads. This suggestion comes from the Secretary of Agriculture, under the authority to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. I think this is one of the mischiefs of our method of making appropriations. We are doing work in various departments, and here is a great corps of engineers whose business it is to understand all about irrigation as applied to farming, and we are also building up this bureau in the Department of Agriculture, really duplicating the work that those engineers must do, in order to be informed about irrigation projects, and there are engineers to spare in that department.

Mr. LEVER. It is not really a duplication in the usual sense of the word "duplication." We are trying here to concentrate these engineers in one bureau, in order to prevent duplication, at least in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTIN. I know from actual observation and experience that the problems connected with irrigation, and the application of irrigation to farming, are being studied by those engineers in the Reclamation Service, and anyone desiring to be informed ought to be able to ascertain information from that service, without the necessity of duplicating and multiplying appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think this amendment is so juicy that it may precipitate a good deal of discussion, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be closed in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. May we have the amendment reported again, so that we will know what it is?

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. BARTON], for I know something about the needs of this country in southwestern Nebraska, and even in northwestern Kansas. I have in my mind a farmer, who unfortunately lost his life last spring, who was willing, if this effort would be made by the Government, to supply, in addition to whatever money the Government would use in boring wells, all the labor that was necessary.

It is a rich land; it is a rich country; but, like some parts of Texas, it needs rain. It needs water. With the needed water it would make a productive country. If the Government would search for these subterranean streams I believe it would find an immense amount of water coming from the mountains that settles into the earth with underground streams. I am firm in the belief that if a number of ponds were impounded that it would cause, on account of evaporation, more rainfall, and that land in western Nebraska is as rich as any land in the country. I have heard it stated here that when Illinois and Iowa people wanted drainage they drained and tiled their own lands, but they did it after their lands were worth \$100 or \$150 an acre, when they had become rich and could afford to do it. But here is a new country, practically all homesteaders, who have settled there within a few years and have not got the means to do what the Illinois and Iowa farmers did. I believe it would be helpful and develop one of the greatest grain-producing countries in the United States. I am in favor of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, one moment. I am satisfied that under the language of the amendment just read the work contemplated in the amendment can be done. However, I want to say that the committee has given no consideration to the proposition. It was not estimated for. It is a large sum of money, and I trust that the amendment will be voted down.



Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that the department was doing the very thing up to a few years ago and then abandoned it? A number of wells were sunk, but the expense of pumping was so great that they abandoned it.

Mr. LEVER. Not since I have been closely affiliated with the work of the department has that been done; but the gentleman has been on the committee much longer than I have, and I am sure his recollection of the facts is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon farm drainage and upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes; for preparing plans for the removal of surplus water by drainage, and for giving expert assistance by advice or otherwise in the drainage of such lands; for conducting field experiments and investigations concerning the construction and maintenance of farm drainage work; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of farm drainage structures; for the purchase of materials and equipment; and for preparing and illustrating reports and bulletins on drainage; and for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside the District of Columbia, and for supplies and all necessary expenses, \$96,280.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. Following the book that we used in making up the bill, I find that there is a paragraph which I remember we approved of, at the bottom of page 162, and I do not see it in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. I am about to offer that as an amendment, as a new paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to offer an amendment to the existing paragraph. Would a new paragraph cut me out?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think it would.

Mr. MOORE. Then I want to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 69, in line 8, after the word "work," by inserting the following: "For investigating and developing drainage with a view to the extermination of the disease-carrying mosquito."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I question whether this is subject to a point of order. It follows the language of the paragraph closely, and pertains to the department work. However, I desire to speak on the merits and to say that for several years I have undertaken, at the instance of a large number of people who are annoyed by the pest, to have some consideration given in this bill, which appropriates so much money for other insect purposes, to the elimination of the mosquito.

The very efficient but, in this instance, hard-hearted chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], has maintained that the mosquito is a pest that pertains only to man. He contends for that reason that my amendment has no place in an agricultural bill; that the mosquito, to obtain a status here, must harass the plant or disturb the peace of mind of the barnyard fowl or annoy the cow. He seems to want to hold me directly to these animals of the lower kingdom. I contend that there is no pest on earth that in virulence and in its general powers to irritate has a worse effect upon human-kind or animals in both kingdoms than the mosquito. It belongs to no section of the country and can not be confined to any State. It develops everywhere and roams everywhere. Recent scientific information—and all through the bill we have a plethora of scientific helpfulness, from the experts in bugology to the deep thinkers in all the other "ologies"—leads us to believe that the treatment of the mosquito is wrapped up in the drainage question. It is scientific to believe that the mosquito can be conquered by proper drainage; therefore the amendment ought to be in order.

I have looked this bill over and believe the proper place for this amendment is in the drainage paragraph, and I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will come to the same conclusion.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Entomology both are doing considerable work along the line the gentleman suggests, I am constrained to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire what the point of order was?

Mr. LEVER. That it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE. New legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. MOORE. No; I do not; but the Chair ruled so quickly and before I had any explanation of the point of order that I felt myself entitled to know what the point was.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the point was ruled on last year, and ruled out of order.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had no desire to be discourteous to the gentleman in any way. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating and reporting upon farm drainage and upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands which may be made available for agricultural purposes; for preparing plans for the removal of surplus water by drainage, and for giving expert assistance, by advice or otherwise, in the drainage of such lands; for conducting field experiments and investigations concerning the construction and maintenance of farm drainage work; for investigating and developing equipment intended for the construction and maintenance of farm drainage structures; for the purchase of materials and equipment; and for preparing and illustrating reports and bulletins on drainage; and for the employment of assistants and labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for rent outside the District of Columbia, and for supplies and all necessary expenses, \$96,280.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment as a new paragraph, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 15, on page 69, the following paragraph:

"For investigation of farm domestic water supply and drainage disposal and construction of farm buildings and other local engineering problems involving mechanical principles, including the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, supplies, and all other necessary expenses, \$12,805."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I understand the gentleman desires to know about this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly do.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say when the committee first began consideration of the bill and first began making it up it did so on the theory that we were not going to put into the bill any new lines of work unless they were in the nature of emergencies, and the committee reaching this item was not advised at the time that it was a character of work that was already being carried in the Bureau of Plant Industry under the Office of Farm Management, and hence cut the entire item out. Later the Secretary of Agriculture wrote me—

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield? A part of this also has been carried in the Bureau of Animal Industry and also transferred.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. Lately the Secretary of Agriculture wrote to me, and I will read a portion of his letter:

The amount heretofore allotted for the work of construction of farm buildings in the Bureau of Plant Industry alone was \$12,805. If item 40, carrying \$25,000, should not be approved by the committee in its entirety, I sincerely hope that there will be an adequate allowance for the farm architectural work. It is clear that unless \$12,805 is allowed for this work the activities of the department in this direction will be curtailed. Instead of being curtailed they ought to be extended, as there are many demands upon the department for assistance in this direction and very much more could be done than is being done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman show or state where there has been any authorization heretofore for investigation and construction of farm buildings and machinery?

Mr. LEVER. I have just read it to the gentleman. It has heretofore been carried under the general-expense item of farm management. The gentleman will remember heretofore the Office of Farm Management has just simply been carried in one line in the bill, "For farm management," and it has been carried under that language—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me to read a note from the department, so far as farm buildings are concerned, to show that it is entirely new and that it has never been carried heretofore?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know what note the gentleman speaks of, but I read to the gentleman from the Secretary's letter. The Secretary may be giving misinformation—

Mr. STAFFORD. No; but he is not giving all the information. He does not say anything about investigating the subject of farm buildings and machinery.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. This note is entirely consistent with the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. He states what has been heretofore carried and also gives the nature of and the additional amount needed, showing that the investigation of farm buildings and machinery is new. That is why I am protesting

as to the need of this department of engineering stretching out into some new field connected with farm buildings and machinery.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is certainly mistaken, although I am very glad to have—

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not at the moment.

Mr. LEVER. I have just read the gentleman what the Secretary said:

Mr. STAFFORD (reading)—

This item also relates to farm buildings and involves the transfers from other bureaus of specialists engaged in such work. This is also in the interest of economy and efficiency, as this work is of an engineering character.

The Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering is equipped with a mechanical department under the direction of a mechanical engineer, and it is believed that with the small additional appropriation asked for this department can be made of great use to the farmers of the country in connection with the development and testing of farm machinery.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman continue to read?

Mr. STAFFORD. I did read the other, but I read it out of order.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the gentleman to read it into the Record.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have read it into the Record, but I read the last sentence first and then went back. I got the idea by just reading this last statement that this is new work involving an investigation of farm buildings and machinery.

Mr. LEVER. The last sentence shows it is a transfer.

Mr. HAWLEY. The language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, does not include all that was proposed in the item in the book the gentleman has in his hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. We have modified the language there from the estimates.

Mr. HAWLEY. And the words "and machinery" have been eliminated.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let us have the amendment again reported, Mr. Chairman, but not out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the item that I am most opposed to is the investigation into the construction of farm buildings. I think that is an idle proposition.

Mr. LEVER. But we changed it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The phraseology of the amendment as now proposed will cover all the activities, even in the more specific wording, of the Book of Estimates.

Mr. LEVER. I differ with the gentleman. We changed the language because we wanted to modify it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection if the gentleman would strike out the "construction of farm buildings." I do not wish to limit the activities of this department. I have no objection to investigating farm drainage disposal. I see no need, however, of a scientific investigation of the construction of farm buildings. Farmers know what they need with respect to their buildings.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is not a new project. It was carried in at least two bills.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that we had the man in charge of this work before the committee, and his testimony was to the effect that there was a tremendous demand throughout the country for the study of the most economical and advanced plans for the building of small farm homes. He submitted to the committee a number of letters from engineering societies all over the country commending his work, and he submitted also a number of pictures to the committee, together with plans and drawings and the like of that. I think this is very important work. We had a special hearing on it after the bill was made up, and the result of it is this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is allowed to remain in this act, will the subsequent appropriation be increased?

Mr. LEVER. Not so long as I am chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will certainly be chairman of the committee until a vacancy occurs in another body, and we all know that he will then fill that vacancy with credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin withdraw his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his point of order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order, or reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to know the difference between this amendment, so far as it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, and the amendment which I offered a little while ago and which the Chairman ruled out.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I am not sure that this amendment is in order here in the first place, but this whole Agricultural bill relates to agriculture. The gentleman's proposition was a medical proposition, a scientific study of diseases of the body.

Mr. MOORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It related wholly to drainage, as it pertains to the mosquito. It is purely an agricultural proposition.

Mr. LEVER. That is one of the very things that should be kept out of this bill.

Mr. MOORE. It is just as pertinent as many of the items that have been inserted in the bill. There are some people who say that because there is \$660,000 in this bill for investigations of the cotton-boll weevil that therefore the bill is a "pork-barrel" bill, just as they say it of a rivers and harbors bill. I want the gentlemen to remember that it is perfectly easy to rule out an amendment that does not meet the approval of the committee on the ground that the amendment contains legislation tacked onto an appropriation bill; but it is not always fair for the committee to come in with an amendment that proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and have everybody sit quiescent and allow it to pass.

Now, I consider the destruction of the mosquito more important, not only to the animal kingdom, but also to the human family, than a provision attached to the bill making an appropriation to buy more machinery or pay more salaries. That is my point.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MOORE. I do not make the point of order. Having said what I desire to say, and having shown that some of us are on guard over here, and that we appreciate the power which the committee has over the proceedings of the House, I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Nobody doubts that the gentleman is on guard all the time.

Mr. MOORE. Of course; I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, in regard to that item for investigation as to the construction of farm buildings, does that recommendation come from the farmers throughout the country or does it come from engineering societies?

Mr. LEVER. From both. Mr. Atherton, who has charge of this work, showed us half a dozen letters and indicated that he has a great number more, many from farm women, asking about plans for building a kitchen and building farm homes. It was very interesting.

Mr. BAILEY. In other words, as I understand, the people of this country have come to look to the "Little Father in Washington" for all kinds of guidance?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I think that is true. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 49, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, \$497,700.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the membership of the committee of this House and the country would be pleased to know that it is possible to thrash and put wheat into the sack or bag at a cost of 2 cents a bushel.

I go back to the days of the old cradle, when the farmer used the cradle to cut his wheat, and from that time down to the



time of the reaper, and from that down to the twine binder, that ties the bundles and throws the bundles into a pile.

A MEMBER. Into a shock.

Mr. HELM. Oh, they do not shock it. Now, I am speaking of something that is worth the attention of you gentlemen. Here is a proposition. A gentleman by the name of Jones stopped at the hotel where I board who has invented a machine that will cut, thrash, and put in the sack wheat at 2 cents a bushel, as against 12 cents under the old methods that have been used heretofore. In these degenerate days, when a man invents a gun that can destroy 300 or 400 men at a shot, or knock down a city, his name is heralded to the world as a genius; but a man who can put up and operate something that makes for good, a machine that lightens the burdens of life, and who accomplishes something good for mankind, gets no attention, is never heard of; and when a man gets upon the floor here and talks about an invention that has done as much to benefit mankind as the sewing machine did in its day, or as the screw propeller did for ocean navigation, or the cotton gin for the planter, when a man presents a proposition that will reduce the cost of harvesting grain from 12 cents a bushel to 2 cents a bushel, there is a ripple of laughter in the House of Representatives, from men who are presumed to be at least sometimes serious in the matters in which they are engaged.

Mr. NORTON. I come from a wheat-raising State. Can the gentleman tell us where this machine is in operation?

Mr. HELM. The name of the inventor is Mr. Jones, and he comes from Walla Walla, Wash.

Mr. NORTON. It cuts, harvests, and thrashes and stacks grain at 2 cents a bushel?

Mr. HELM. He cuts the grain and thrashes it and puts it in sacks at 2 cents a bushel, assuming that you have a yield of 50 bushels to the acre.

Mr. NORTON. That is quite an assumption in the wheat-raising country. Of course, it might be all right here.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will inform the gentleman that it is not too much of an assumption. I have seen many a field out there that averaged 65 bushels to the acre.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HELM. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELM. I suppose some of you gentlemen here doubt that there is such a machine. I suppose some of you are so skeptical that you will not believe there is such a machine, but it is in operation. It cut approximately 320 acres of grain last season without a single breakdown, going all the time.

Mr. SLOAN. Was that a season's work—320 acres?

Mr. HELM. Oh, no.

Mr. SLOAN. I was going to say that that would be a very slim season's work.

Mr. HELM. Oh, no. You will understand that this gentleman has only recently got his machine perfected, and that was only a try out.

Mr. ADAIR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HELM. Certainly.

Mr. ADAIR. What effect would the use of such machines have on the demand for labor?

Mr. HELM. I suppose, like all similar labor-saving machines, it would reduce the number of persons employed in harvesting.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. HELM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the invention of the sewing machine was opposed because it was feared it would lessen the demand for labor, but, on the contrary, it increased it very greatly?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Has not that been the universal experience with labor-saving machinery?

Mr. HELM. I think so.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. In connection with the question of the gentleman from Indiana, I want to ask what effect it would have on the price of bread?

Mr. HELM. I should naturally suppose it would cheapen it, if we could get away from the Biscuit Trusts.

Mr. BUTLER. Can you not mow down the trusts? [Laughter.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Does not the gentleman know that there is only a small section of the United States where that machine could be used?

Mr. HELM. Here is a picture of the machine running on a hillside.

Mr. HELGESEN. Let me tell the gentleman something he does not know, that in the great wheat section the grain does not ripen on the straw so that it can be thrashed at the time it is cut. This machine can only be used on the Pacific coast or where the grain will ripen on the stalk, so that it can be thrashed at that time.

Mr. HELM. The inventor claims that the machine can be successfully operated in any wheat section of the country.

Mr. BUTLER. Is this machine for sale?

Mr. HELM. It is for sale, and I have not a particle of interest in it and never expect to have.

Mr. BUTLER. I know my friend has not. How much does it cost?

Mr. HELM. It costs less than a thousand dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky has concluded.

Mr. HELM. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Office of Markets and Rural Organization: One chief clerk, \$2,000; 4 clerks, class 4; 5 clerks, class 3; 9 clerks, class 2; 10 clerks, class 1; 5 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$900; 2 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$720; 2 laboratory aids, at \$600 each; 1 map tracer, \$720; 1 map tracer, \$600; 2 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 1 laborer, \$540; 4 messenger boys, at \$480 each; in all, \$56,400.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope it has not escaped the attention of the Members of this House that the newspapers report a hurried meeting of the Cabinet at the Treasury yesterday for the purpose of revising downward the estimates submitted to Congress in December last by the various departments of the Government.

This is a belated recognition of a grave situation, but it is better late than never.

However, I observe in the account of the retrenchment conference that the deficit of more than \$80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30 next is attributed to "reckless appropriations by Congress, chiefly in 'pork-barrel' rivers and harbors and public buildings bills," no mention being made of the Army bill, the fortifications bill, or the Navy bill, although they cap all records for these in times of peace. Apparently there is no thought of retrenching in the direction of "preparedness." The Army bill carries \$101,000,000 and the Navy bill as drawn calls for an expenditure of more than \$148,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, early in the life of this Congress I took occasion more than once to remind Democrats of what I have called the "forgotten plank" of the Baltimore platform—that plank pledging the Democratic Party to rigid economy in public expenditures—but without avail. Republican extravagance which we had denounced was outdone by our own party, and no serious effort on the part of our leaders, let it be said with regret, was made to curb the saturnalia of extravagance. In a most flagrant manner was economy disregarded in making provision for Army and Navy. Had we been face to face with a foreign war we could not have spent money with a more lavish hand.

We are told that the income tax has proved disappointing. That was to have been expected. The income tax is, after all, a tax on conscience, and the conscience of those possessing taxable incomes is sometimes elastic. Incomes in some mysterious manner shrink at the approach of the inquisitor. They never yield quite the revenue which they are expected to furnish.

The emergency tax law has likewise disappointed the expectations of Treasury officials and party leaders. It has not yielded the returns hoped for. It fails to make up the deficit in revenues occasioned by the decline in customs receipts since the outbreak of the European conflagration. Either the country must seek out new sources of supply or it must lay the ax at the root of the tree of extravagance.

For my part, Mr. Chairman, I have voted consistently for economy. In some cases I have been compelled to part company with my party leaders in doing so. I have felt that I owed no higher duty to the people than that of standing across the path of those headed toward the Treasury; and this I have done as best I might, not always or often successfully, but I have stood there nevertheless.

While money has been wasted on rivers and harbors, and perhaps also on public buildings, the waste here at the very worst has been negligible in comparison with that on battle-ships, big guns, fortifications, and militaristic expansion. For every dollar wasted in the one direction a hundred dollars have been wasted in the other. The country has something material to show for the money it devotes to rivers and harbors; it has something material to show for the money it invests in public

buildings; it has something material to show for the sums it spends on agriculture and other activities designed to promote the development of our resources; but what has it to show for the enormous sums it has devoted to naval and military expansion? It has a vast array of fighting machines of one sort or another; it has nearly 200,000 men drawn from gainful pursuits to be borne on the backs of the workers of the land; and it has a shouting and tumultuous band of patriots, of whom the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is perhaps the most vociferous, who insist that, with all the expenditure, we are unprepared for defense and in so sorry a plight that the nations of the earth make merry at our expense.

Of course this is sheer tommyrot. It is inspired, it is to be feared, by other than genuinely patriotic motives. But that it is sweeping this Congress before it is only too apparent. The question then arises, Shall jingoism prevail or shall sober sense resume its sway and put an end to the orgy of militaristic extravagance, which has already gone too far?

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distributing of farm and food products, \$238,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee how much of this lump sum of \$238,000 is for salaries. In the first paragraph you appropriate \$56,400, entirely for the salary list.

Mr. LEVER. That is for statutory salaries.

Mr. BOOHER. How much of this \$238,000 is appropriated for salaries?

Mr. LEVER. Necessarily the larger part of this appropriation is for salaries and traveling expenses. This is the lump sum, which carries the scientific force of the office.

Mr. BOOHER. Does the gentleman mean to say that it costs \$56,400 and \$238,000 for salaries to run this bureau?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Missouri must understand that we are not employing any soldiers or building anything, but practically our whole appropriation is a matter of salaries. The whole Department of Agriculture is made up of men who are employed upon salaries. There is a scientific force and a statutory roll, and, outside of rent and traveling expenses, practically every dollar of this appropriation is expended for salaries.

Mr. BOOHER. How long has the bureau been organized?

Mr. LEVER. It was organized two years ago, with an appropriation of \$50,000.

Mr. BOOHER. And it has grown to \$352,650 in two years—a pretty rapid growth.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but they have transferred some work from other bureaus. The total increase is about \$90,000.

Mr. BOOHER. It is more than that, because the bill now appropriates \$352,650.

Mr. LEVER. But that represents a considerable number of transfers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if he can state briefly what progress is being made by the Department of Agriculture in the work cut out for it under this appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. The Office of Markets in the outline of its work promises to develop into one of the most important lines of activity in all the Department of Agriculture. Of course it is a new work, and a large part of the time has been spent in organizing the work. It has been a very difficult matter to get men of that expert training, comprehension of facts, and understanding necessary in the conduct of the study of the problems of marketing. But they have made substantial progress in their investigation and study, and they have been of immense use in their work with the Committee on Agriculture both in the cotton-futures act, the grain-standardization bill, and the warehouse bill, and various other lines of constructive legislation that the committee has been studying. I think the office is now prepared to do very good fundamental work.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I ask whether or not it is the purpose of the office to extend its work so as to give the farmer information as to the foreign markets, or whether or not it is proposed to confine it altogether to the markets in this country?

Mr. LEVER. The language of the item under which various other items are allowed here is so broad that I am satisfied that the whole problem of marketing as to its effects on agri-

culture in this country, both domestic and foreign, can be investigated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Pending that, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. There are quite a number that want to speak.

Mr. MANN. Make it 15 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. There are several on this side who want to speak.

Mr. MANN. If they are going to speak 25 minutes, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. My colleagues will see the situation that we have here, and we must complete this bill this afternoon if we have to keep a quorum here all night. I do not think it will be necessary, but gentlemen can never tell in the consideration of a bill what will happen. I would be glad to accommodate Members, but I can not do it. If we are going to get through the bill in a reasonable time we must not devote so much debate to every provision. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate be limited on this paragraph and amendments thereto to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask what that paragraph includes?

Mr. LEVER. From line 13 to line 21.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I do not care to speak on that.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am offering an amendment, which I believe to be an important amendment whether it is in order or not in this paragraph, and I certainly want the right to speak five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The Chair will control the time. Personally, I should be glad to have the gentleman have the time, and if the gentleman from Tennessee will expedite his questions, there will be a few minutes of my own time left.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I agree with him. I do not think there is a more important appropriation in the bill, so far as the farmer is concerned, than this, and I hoped the office had proceeded far enough so that they could undertake to make some investigations in the foreign field as well as in the local or domestic field.

Mr. LEVER. I am sure that when we come back next year we can report great progress in this work, probably along the lines the gentleman suggests.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] asked what progress this Bureau of Markets had made. I do not believe that the gentlemen of this House have given this part of the Agricultural Department proper consideration. The poor farmer—and when I say the poor farmer I mean the man engaged in diversified farming, the man who digs his living out of the ground my making food to feed the human race—has been taught by the Government many years how to make crops, but we are not showing him the places or the methods of marketing. I refer to the seventh district of Mississippi, where the boll weevil virtually put that prosperous part of the country out of commission. These farmers have learned diversification of crops, but they are up against the proposition of getting a market for their corn, their molasses, their potatoes, Irish and sweet, and all kinds of vegetables. This Bureau of Markets should show the men producing these crops the best method of packing, the best method of marketing, and a way to find the markets for these farm products, and the Government should furnish an inspection that will keep them from being cheated by the commission dealers or middlemen in the cities. That, in my judgment, is what the Bureau of Markets should devote its attention to. The gentleman from Tennessee wanted to know if they could look out for the foreign markets. We have people in this country that they should look out for. People in the cities are crying for diversified products of the farm. You can not get them to the cities without the poor farmer being robbed in commissions and transportation charges. In Washington you pay 50 cents a peck for corn meal, and in the seventh district of Mississippi the farmer can



not as a rule get more than four bits a bushel for his corn. There is something wrong when the farmer can not get full value for his labor out of his crops. That is what the bureau ought to do, to show the people where they can sell their products and the people in the cities can get their stuff for reasonable prices without the farmer being oppressed and without the people in the city being robbed. The farmer and the consumer should be brought together, and when the Bureau of Markets gets its machinery operating in a systematic way a great portion of the waste, expense, and stealage will be done away with. Then the poor farmer will get a fair price for the products of his farm and the poor consumer in the city can eat a plenty. As it is now the consumer pays an exorbitant price for the things he eats and the farmer hardly gets enough for it to keep soul and body together. A few middlemen and transportation companies are getting rich off of the labor of the farmers. The farmer must get relief, and you fellows had better get busy in his behalf.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure, of course, the gentleman does not want to discriminate against any class of farmers of this country. I want to call his attention to the fact that there are some farm products for which there is no market in this country, particularly dark tobacco, which is exported to Europe. Now, does not the gentleman think that it is the duty of the office of the Bureau of Markets to undertake to give to the tobacco farmers who grow tobacco for the purpose of export the same facilities for a market and the same information that it does to other farmers?

Mr. QUIN. Why, certainly I do; but that is something that the world is bound to have. They are bound to have that tobacco. Men are going to chew and smoke tobacco just as long as the breath of Adam is in them, and we have to have the markets to sell tobacco in. Now, in reference to the tobacco markets, they have organized a great trust to oppress the tobacco farmers. We know that is the case. Mr. Chairman, the proposition the gentleman is talking about will be attended to later. We have a bill passed by the last Congress that will prevent the thieves in the Tobacco Trust from robbing the producers of tobacco. I contend that the farmer of this country right now needs this Market Bureau extended. The gentleman from Missouri seems to think there is too much money expended on it. I want to spend more on the Bureau of Markets, for I realize the sale and distribution of farm products is bound to be handled in a sensible and practicable way. Instead of spending that money on these men going around to look over the great mountains of this country, instead of spending it on men going around to look at the beautiful spots to establish parks, there can be no better work done by the Agriculture Department than to find markets for the farm products of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. BOOHER. If the gentleman referred to me as objecting to this—

Mr. QUIN. No; not as objecting to it; but that there was some extravagance about it.

Mr. BOOHER. No; my question was only as to how this money was all spent or how much of the lump sum has been spent for salaries; that is all.

Mr. QUIN. I am in favor of expending whatever money is necessary to extend the Bureau of Markets in every possible manner to help the farmers of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to the paragraph which has already been sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS: Page 70, line 16, after the word "products," insert "and for establishing and operating an exchange, with the necessary branches thereof, for the economic sale and distribution of farm products, and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish, at as early date as practicable, a farm-produce exchange, with such branches thereof as may be necessary, in order to afford a medium through which the economic and systematic sale and distribution of such products may be effected."

"In the operation of such exchange the Secretary of Agriculture, as far as practicable, shall cooperate with the several States and the various agencies therein which may be utilized, and may formulate plans and regulations for exchange of service between them and such exchange."

"It shall be the duty of each of the departments of the Government to furnish the Secretary of Agriculture with such statistics and data as they may acquire which would be useful in the operation of such exchange, and to render such other service in the sale and distribution of farm products through such exchange as it would be practicable to render."

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall keep advised as nearly as practicable with the details of the quantity, quality, location, and price at which held, of agricultural products and the volume and location of

demand in the United States and abroad, and the price at which such products may be sold, and shall make such information available to the producer and purchaser of such products, and shall endeavor to bring about such system in the sale and distribution of such products as shall eliminate the waste and extremes in prices resulting from the present lack of system therein."

"Those desiring to offer products for sale through such exchange may do so by grade or by sample delivered to such exchange, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, but all tenders of such products shall be for a definite quantity and quality: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit contracts for the sale of such products to be made upon a basis grade, with the option to deliver other grades in fulfillment of such contract: *Provided, however*, That no contracts shall be made through said exchange permitting a delivery within a wider range of grades than the ordinary user of such product dealt in uses in the general conduct of his business wherein such products are used, nor upon any other delivery value difference than the commercial difference between the basis grade and the grade or grades delivered."

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to require such deposits in money, bond, or other guaranty of compliance with the obligation to deliver according to tender or receive and pay according to offer as in his judgment may be necessary to insure compliance with the contracts made through such exchange."

"All information furnished by such exchange shall not be at a higher cost than that necessary to defray the expenses of transmission."

"No charges shall be made to individual producers or to producers' organizations for services rendered in effecting sales of products grown by them or by their members, as the case may be."

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish such rules and regulations governing transactions through said exchange and the service rendered by said exchange as in his discretion may be deemed necessary."

During the reading of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. SUMNERS. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I also reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I submit there has been enough read to put the matter before the House. If the gentleman wants to talk on the subject, he had better proceed; if not, we will have to make the point of order against it in order to save time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk proceeded with and concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved against the amendment, and nine minutes are left for debate.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by myself, to create a produce exchange and a clearing house of information, does not propose to bring the Government into a new field of activity. It would only bring the Government activity into a field already occupied by it, into rational conformity with the conditions which now obtain in that field. The Government has definitely committed itself to the policy of aiding agriculture to deal properly with its big problems. For this purpose the Agriculture Department was created. As community isolation and community self-sufficiency have disappeared with improved transportation facilities and the development of great cities, there has been added to the two original great agricultural problems—production and preservation of soil fertility—a third and the most difficult one, namely, that of sale and distribution of farm products. The amendment is intended to confer the necessary power upon the Secretary of Agriculture to enable him to bring the activities of the Agriculture Department into the new field of difficulty. Mr. Chairman, I can not understand upon what theory opposition to this amendment can be based. Everybody knows that production, preservation in the soil of the power to continue to produce, and the proper disposition of the products by the producers constitute the farmer's business.

The farmer's business being indispensable to the very existence of all people, its difficulties have been taken cognizance of by all the enlightened Governments of the world. A special department in each of them has been created to protect the public interest by aiding farmers to deal with the big problems of agriculture. No gentleman on this floor can deny that the sale and distribution of farm products is the most difficult of the three. Underpaid farmers on the one hand and underfed people on the other, because of the wasteful and absurd system of sale and distribution of farm products demand the creation of the necessary machinery for their distribution. Mr. Chairman, within the memory of men yet active in the affairs of this country but a small percentage of agricultural products entered into the channels of commerce. Production was primarily to supply the family of the producers and was diversified to meet their needs.



Local necessity, rather than the adaptability of the soil, fixed the character of crops. Then the people conformed to local production. When the land raised wheat but not corn, the family ate flour bread; and when it raised corn and not wheat, they ate corn bread. Of the small percentage sold a large part went to the neighboring towns and villages. They had to use what the community produced. The expense of transportation would not permit outside products to come in, and the expense of transportation would not carry products far away. The slowness of transportation barred perishable products from distant markets. If this condition had not changed I would not be offering this amendment, but it has completely changed. The farmers' children no longer wear homespun clothes, homemade shoes, and so forth. The farmer produces primarily to sell now. The people have moved from the country. Towns have grown to be great cities.

Now, nonfarmers can not purchase from their farmer neighbors. Consumption has moved far from the field of production, not only physically far away but far away in every other sense. Both the producer and the consumer require just what this amendment proposes to create. It would establish between producer and consumer a dependable substitute for the lost personal acquaintance and put them in trading relations with each other. It would reduce the expense of sale and distribution, first, by giving to many agricultural products a commercial status as they come from the farms; second, by making the point of origin the point of sale, thereby enabling products to move from the point of origin to the point of use by the most direct and economical route, and thereby make it possible to have the total volume of movement of all products to a given point of use substantially conform to the total volume of demand for use at that point. I understand full well the difficulties, but I say it is possible of substantial accomplishment. To the extent this accomplishment is achieved, uniformity of price to producers, uniformity of cost to consumers, and uniformity of supply in the markets throughout the country would result. With this exchange and clearing house of information in proper operation the millions of dollars' worth of food products which now decay in the fields after production and in congested markets—a clear loss to farmers—would go to the tables of the people who need them, and at a price which would reduce the cost of their living. Here is the place for those who want to reduce the cost of living to do effective work.

In addition, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the exercise of the power proposed to be conferred by this amendment is necessary to give result to many of the present activities of the Department of Agriculture. We are spending millions of dollars per annum in the department teaching how to produce. I know a man in southwestern Texas, for instance, who absorbed some of this information. He put in a field of lettuce. He worked hard to produce a superior quality and succeeded. He was proud of his achievement. He sent a hundred samples to the different markets. It was pronounced excellent. In great hope he made his first shipment of a carload. He paid in freight charges \$9 above the result of the sale. He tried once more and had to pay \$13 above the receipts, and the rest of his crop rotted in the field. Now, I would like to know what good that enthusiastic Government agent did that man or the people who wanted lettuce to eat, but who did not know where the lettuce could be found, while the man did not know where the need was. A few years ago somebody went over into east Texas and inspired the people along the Cotton Belt Railroad to put in Irish potatoes. There was much enthusiasm. When the potatoes were harvested, they discovered that potatoes were bringing a good price in St. Louis. They all shipped to that market, and their returns would not pay for the seed they had planted. The much-preached doctrine of diversification received a solar-plexus blow in that country. We were told that our eastern section is a great peach country, and it is. I know of one concern that spent nearly half a million dollars developing a peach orchard. They have cut down hundreds of acres of bearing trees and put the land in cotton because of the uncertainty—the gamble of trying to reach a profitable market.

I have seen field after field of cantaloupes rotting because there was no market. The local stores, when they could sell them at all, were retailing the choicest ones at 10 cents a dozen, while in a neighboring State they were retailing at 10 cents apiece. I have seen thousands of bushels of tomatoes rotting on the plants when no doubt the poor people in your cities could not afford to have them for Sunday dinner, because of the local price. We have been spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to kill the boll weevil, and I have seen figures compiled showing the number of bales of cotton destroyed per year, and then this number of bales multiplied by the price, to show the loss to the South resulting from this ravage. When

everybody knows that a small crop of cotton brings more money than a large one, not because it ought to, but because of the methods under which it is sold. There is absolutely no medium through which the investing energy of the world can reach and safely purchase the chief product of my people. There is no open market, no market place except for the professional operator. Had such an agency existed this year as this amendment proposes to create, cotton would not have gone within 2 cents per pound of the price to which it went. Millions and millions of money from all over the country would have gone into competitive bidding against the professional speculator, if the ordinary individual could have made his investment through such an agency, assured as he would have been of integrity of transaction, protection against physical damage to his purchase, and that without further personal attention, through the same dependable agency he could later sell his purchase. I know this to be a fact, because I talked to people from different sections of the country, who believed cotton a good investment, and were willing to back their judgment with their money.

The biggest problem of agriculture is not that of production. My people always produce as much as they can get a fair price for under present marketing methods. What I want the Agriculture Department to do, after it has taught my people how to raise more, is to prevent the application of that information from working an injury to them. There is nothing extreme about this amendment. It proposes the safe and common-sense thing to do under existing conditions. I hope you will not confuse this with any valorization scheme or thing of that sort. I have never asked for valorization of cotton by the National Government. I would not for anything on earth put it in the power of Congress to fix the price of the cotton which my people produce. Those of us who come from the cotton districts constitute about one-fourth of the membership of this body. The same power that could fix the price at 15 cents per pound could fix it at 5 cents. I mean no reflection on this Congress, but I know human nature, and three-fourths of you represent constituents who do not raise cotton. I am not only not asking you to fix a price, but I am not willing to give that power to you. I am not asking for anything artificial. I want to destroy the artificial, the clique-controlled market of the country, and establish an honest market place, an open market place, for the actual products of the soil, a market place in which the whole world can trade with full assurance of protection. I want again to direct attention to the language of the amendment.

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish, at as early date as practicable, a farm-produce exchange, with such branches thereof as may be necessary, in order to afford a medium through which the economic and systematic sale and distribution of such products may be effected.

In the operation of such exchange the Secretary of Agriculture, as far as practicable, shall cooperate with the several States and the various agencies therein which may be utilized, and may formulate plans and regulations for exchange of service between them and such exchange.

It shall be the duty of each of the departments of the Government to furnish the Secretary of Agriculture with such statistics and data as they may acquire which would be useful in the operation of such exchange, and to render such other service in the sale and distribution of farm products through such exchange as it would be practicable to render.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall keep advised as nearly as practicable with the details of the quantity, quality, location, and price at which held of agricultural products and the volume and location of demand in the United States and abroad and the price at which such products may be sold, and shall make such information available to the producer and purchaser of such products, and shall endeavor to bring about such system in the sale and distribution of such products as shall eliminate the waste and extremes in prices resulting from the present lack of system therein.

Those desiring to offer products for sale through such exchange may do so by grade or by sample delivered to such exchange, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe, but all tenders of such products shall be for a definite quantity and quality: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit contracts for the sale of such products to be made upon a basis grade, with the option to deliver other grades in fulfillment of such contract: *Provided, however*, That no contracts shall be made through said exchange permitting a delivery within a wider range of grades than the ordinary user of such product dealt in uses in the general conduct of his business wherein such products are used, nor upon any other delivery value difference than the commercial difference between the basis grade and the grade or grades delivered.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to require such deposits in money, bond, or other guaranty of compliance with the obligation to deliver according to tender or receive and pay according to offer as in his judgment may be necessary to insure compliance with the contracts made through such exchange.

All information furnished by such exchange shall not be at a higher cost than that necessary to defray the expenses of transmission.

No charges shall be made to individual producers or to producers' organizations for services rendered in effecting sales of products grown by them or by their members, as the case may be.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish such rules and regulations governing transactions through said exchange and the service rendered by said exchange as in his discretion may be deemed necessary.



This amendment is governmentally and economically sound. I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the plan suggested by the amendment does not contemplate the construction of a marketing machine, but the assembling of the parts of this machine which are now in existence, supplying only the necessary parts to put it into operation. The present organization of the Agricultural Department and of a number of other departments can be utilized. The entire agricultural organization of the several States can be utilized as well as cooperative organization throughout the country, and so can the Consular Service abroad. The necessity for this service by the Federal Government is obvious. No State can create such a marketing agency for its products as is needed, because much of the products of each move interstate. The movement of the products of a given State might be highly systematized and yet failure result because of conflicting shipments from other States. Interstate and foreign commerce under our Constitution is exclusively under the control of the National Government. The several States could deal with production and soil conservation within their respective confines, but they have no extraterritorial jurisdiction which would enable them to deal with marketing beyond their borders. We are therefore confronted with a situation where we have an Agricultural Department dealing with that two of the three big problems of agriculture which the several States have full and complete power to deal with, and practically ignoring the only one of the three big problems which the States can not deal with. If there is any common sense or governmental wisdom in this, I am unable to discover it, and therefore I have offered this amendment. I presume it will go out on a point of order.

But the time will come when it will have a more favorable reception. I am not guessing. I know it. I recognize it is a very difficult thing which I propose; that is why I am urging that we begin now before the situation becomes more acute. We ought to legislate now while we can do it deliberately and give the Secretary of Agriculture time to work out the problems involved. It seems to me that any man who will open his eyes to developments must see that upon the heels of this problem of sale and distribution is coming the problem of building up and holding in reserve a sufficient quantity of food to insure against the hazards of current production. The machine proposed by this amendment will be indispensable to that service. No change of so great importance to all the people ever progressed with such rapidity as that by which the world's reserve supply of food is being exhausted. You men from the great cities may be indifferent now, but you will not be indifferent long. Your people are more and more paying the preventable cost which I have mentioned. You are more and more paying in the price given for that which you consume the value of that which wastes after production. Your people more than my people will suffer when the time comes when there is not enough food for all.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I consider this Office of Markets one of the most important in the Department of Agriculture. It was suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] a little while ago that the expense of this office has increased quite rapidly in the short length of time it has been in existence. I helped to establish it two years ago with an appropriation of \$50,000. Last year we made an appropriation for it of \$200,000, and this year, by reason of transfers from other offices and divisions of the Department of Agriculture to this Office of Markets and its increasing work, it required a necessary increase, which brings it up to the appropriation that is recommended in the present bill of \$484,050.

Nevertheless, the work that has already been done by this office justifies the expenditures that have been made. It has assisted in the preparation and passage in this House of some very important legislation. One of the bills was the United States cotton-futures act. Another was the warehouse act. Still another was the State grain act, which passed the House a few days ago. Another still is the United States cotton-standardization act, which is pending with a favorable committee report at the present time.

The work which this office proposes developing is along the lines of cotton handling and marketing; cooperative purchasing and marketing; market surveys, methods, and costs; market grades and standards; city marketing and distribution; transportation and storage; miscellaneous problems in marketing and collaboration; marketing by parcel post and express; marketing live stock, meats, and animal by-products; marketing business practice; grain market investigations.

These are the subjects which will engage the attention of this office during the next year. As was suggested a moment ago, it is not so much the production in this country, because

we have a good deal of that—and it is increasing year by year—but the great question that is engaging the minds of the American people to-day is where we can best dispose of products after they are brought into existence. It is to devise ways and means whereby the producer can realize the highest benefit from the products which he brings into existence. If we can bring the producer and the consumer close together and eliminate so far as possible the middle man, who now gets the great bulk of the selling price to-day, we will have accomplished a solution of a very great question which is before the American people at the present time. [Applause.] So that I say that this bureau has begun a great work which will go on from year to year. It is true that it promises the very best field in which to labor for the benefit of the man who produces the farm products which the people who buy them desire to secure at the lowest possible price, and one of the great questions that we all know is confronting the American people to-day is the high cost of living.

We desire to reduce the cost of living if it is possible to do so, and in order to reduce it we want the producer to get the best possible price from the man who consumes the product and eliminate this terrible expense that intervenes between the sale of the product by the producer and its purchase by the man who buys it at the end of the line for his own personal use. If we do that, the cost of living will be very materially reduced, and that is a matter of vital importance to the American people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to incorporate in my remarks a further discussion of this item in this bill, prepared by Hon. Charles J. Brand, Chief of Office of Markets and Rural Organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The statement prepared by Mr. Brand is the following:

MEMORANDUM REGARDING INCREASE IN APPROPRIATION FOR THE OFFICE OF MARKETS AND RURAL ORGANIZATION.

#### GENERAL CONSIDERATION.

"An increase is recommended for this branch of the work because this is a new organization which has necessarily been feeling its way, but which has now done the preliminary work which has brought it to the point where definite services of far-reaching importance can be performed. It has developed a viewpoint and personnel which justify the expectation of exceptional usefulness in several specific fields.

"Before outlining the exact lines of work upon which this increase will be spent, I wish to say that the money already spent in what may be called preliminary work has produced valuable results, for this office has been of material assistance to Congress in framing at least four important economic measures, one of which—the United States cotton futures act—has become a law, and its enforcement is now in the hands of this office.

"The second is the United States warehouse act, which has passed both Houses in different forms and which we confidently expect to see enacted before the close of this session.

"The third is the United States grain grades act, which has just passed this House by an overwhelming vote; and the fourth is the United States cotton standards act, which is now before this House with a favorable report from this committee, and it may be said in passing that this is really the most far-reaching measure of all.

"Had the Office of Markets and Rural Organization rendered the country no other service, its existence would be amply justified and the money appropriated for its use would have yielded a very satisfactory return. This, however, is far from the case. From the work already done we have every reason to expect as great help from this office when we are ready to consider the regulation of cold storages and commission houses, and inspection service under suitable supervision, and other economic questions already pressing for attention.

"The increase recommended will enable the office to actually set in motion new services of direct money value to the public, as well as important fundamental investigational work, upon which in the end improvements in our marketing system will rest.

"The regular lines of work in this office were presented to the committee in some detail when the hearings were held for the annual appropriation for the present fiscal year. These include cotton handling and marketing; cooperative purchasing and marketing; market surveys, methods, and costs; market grades and standards; city marketing and distribution; trans-



portation and storage; miscellaneous problems in marketing and collaboration; marketing by parcel post and express.

"The work on these projects will be continued necessarily under the appropriation here proposed, but the added amounts beyond those absolutely necessary to provide for slight additional growth will be devoted to three new projects, namely, marketing live stock, meats, and animal by-products; marketing business practice; and grain-marketing investigations; and to the extension of the market news-service work in the form of a demonstration under the project established last year, entitled 'Market surveys, methods, and costs.'

"In addition this office is charged with the work which has to do with rural credits, agricultural insurance, and rural social and educational activities, the appropriation for which during the current year is carried in the miscellaneous section of the last agricultural appropriation bill. In the plan of reorganization all of this work has been included in a single administrative unit.

"The character of the work and its importance warrants a slightly more detailed discussion of it than usual and will be taken up under the headings suggested above.

#### MARKETING LIVE STOCK, MEATS, AND ANIMAL BY-PRODUCTS.

"Considering the importance of the great market centers which handle a large proportion of the live stock sold in the United States, a thorough study of the organization, equipment, methods, and charges for services rendered at these markets is essential to the interest of all who produce or consume animal products. In this work special attention will be given to the efficiency of methods and reasonableness of charges for feed, yardage, and handling of live stock. It should be determined whether the prevailing rates and customs are equitable and whether the regulations in force operate to the advantage of patrons to a reasonable degree. In the nature of our marketing system these central markets should be regarded as public-service institutions. In view of the interstate character of the bulk of shipments passing through them, they are to a degree a proper subject for Federal control, at least so far as may be necessary to insure fair and efficient service.

"Transportation facilities to and from the market centers likewise determine in a large measure the economy and dispatch with which farm live stock and their products may be marketed. Hence there are numerous railroad problems which vitally concern the stockmen, not only regarding freight rates, but availability of cars, stock train service and accommodations, proper loading facilities, feeding stations en route, live-stock contracts, and liability of carriers for loss and damage.

"The sale of farm live stock involves peculiar problems in localities where farmers have less than carload lots for sale. Even in the older cattle and hog feeding districts a considerable proportion of stock must be disposed of in small numbers at a time. Local buyers or speculators frequently impose large margins of profit in handling their purchases and form little trusts among themselves to maintain such margins in a community. Farmers' cooperative live-stock shipping associations within recent years have proven a successful means of avoiding some of the costs of the local middleman's service, and an extension of this movement in various parts of the country offers an exceptional opportunity for aid on the part of the Federal Department of Agriculture.

"Classification and grading of live stock and meats, both at the market centers and in local communities, will be given careful study with a view to establishing standards of quality among dealers, instructing producers of live stock as to market demands and conducting a campaign of education among consumers, looking toward a more rational and intelligent selection of meats. Such a standardization would render market quotations more uniform and intelligible, and thereby enable stockmen to operate with greater confidence and precision.

"In different parts of the country where live-stock production is new and undeveloped, as, for example, on western irrigation projects and in parts of the South, where diversified farming is being developed, marketing problems arise which demand prompt and intelligent aid. Adequate help in the solution of these problems can only be extended by Federal agencies, and this work is to be provided for by the Office of Markets and Rural Organization. On the other hand, certain localities and individuals have developed methods of marketing which possess features of marked efficiency, and it should be the function of the Office of Markets and Rural Organization to disseminate the knowledge and encourage the use of these methods in other localities where they are feasible. Examples of this kind are the direct marketing of home-prepared meat products, especially farm-cured hams, bacon, and sausage, municipal and co-

operative slaughtering and curing plants, live-stock shippers' associations, and other forms of cooperation, and the shipment of meats by parcel post.

"Specific and first-hand information is needed regarding the actual cost of marketing live stock and distributing meats and animal by-products as an indication of the efficiency of present market methods, and the margin of profit realized by each class of middleman who participates in the operation. Charges of extortion are freely made, and there is a lamentable lack of cooperation among all parties involved, from the producer to the consumer. Authentic figures representing the entire transaction in detail are almost entirely lacking, and it is desired to conduct carefully planned investigations which will serve as a basis for just conclusions regarding the legitimate and proper place of each class of middleman involved. Information of this kind can not fail to bring about a better understanding and a more confident attitude on the part of producer, middleman, and consumer, and thereby react favorably upon the entire live-stock and meat industry.

#### MARKETING BUSINESS PRACTICE.

"The marketing of agricultural products is a business, and as such, in order to bring the greatest returns to the producer and lessen the price to the consumer, marketing must be conducted in a thorough businesslike way. The farmer is expected to be both manufacturer and salesman. Selling—marketing—is a tough proposition, even more so for farm products than for many manufactured articles. The farmer needs help on it. His physical force is almost exhausted by the work of production.

"While we have considerable literature dealing with the business problems of industrial and commercial enterprises and volumes on cost accounting and efficiency engineering for manufacturing establishments, wholesalers, retailers, municipalities, etc., we have no literature on the fundamental requirements, from a business standpoint, for the proper conduct of cooperative purchasing and marketing organizations and other agencies engaged in the marketing of agricultural products. There is no place where information can be obtained relating to plans of financing farmers' organizations. The requirements for accounting systems and auditing, data relating to modern appliances for offices, methods of obtaining cost per unit of doing business, processes and plans for the elimination of wastes, and other business essentials are unfamiliar to practically all farmers' organizations.

"Realizing the above, and encouraged by the results obtained in helping the farmers' elevators and farmers' produce and fruit exchanges of the country, by the devising of accounting systems, which have been praised by all who have come in contact with them, and by the demand for information that would place marketing agencies on a sounder and safer business basis, it is considered necessary to give concrete and specific help on the business side of marketing. The best results in improving business methods of farm marketing agencies can not be secured by investigations alone. The information gathered must be disseminated in every possible way and especially by well-planned demonstrations.

"If we can prevent the failure of one-tenth of the farmers' elevators which annually fail in this country, due to a lack of knowledge as to certain essential business requirements, it is estimated that we will have saved the farmers in one year several hundred thousand dollars. Over \$100,000 were lost in one year in a northwestern grain State through the failure of farmers' elevators, due to the inefficient business methods employed in their operation. We are told that it costs a certain percentage of the sale price of a product to handle it on a commission basis; that it costs so much to handle a bushel of grain through a local elevator; and that the cost of marketing a pound of butter from the creamery to the retailer is so much, and yet we have no accurate information on these costs. To successfully eliminate waste we must secure the accurate costs of each step in the marketing and distribution of agricultural products, in order that unnecessary wastes and excessive profits may be discovered and eliminated.

"The Department of Agriculture, in the Office of Farm Management, is now engaged in investigating farm bookkeeping and farm cost accounting, and devising systems for keeping farm records, realizing that proper accounting is one of the great needs of the individual farmer. If with his limited knowledge of accounting principles the average farmer is not able to keep such accounts as should be kept for his own farm, how can he be expected to handle a good system of accounts and efficient plan of operation for the marketing of his products? If it is necessary to improve the business of the farmer with relation to his production, is it not as essentially necessary to improve the business of marketing those products?



"It is the purpose of the work above outlined not only to be helpful to the farmers' organizations, but also to give the individual farmer in his marketing business such helpful assistance as may be possible.

"All the various marketing agencies should keep proper accounting records. So doing should eliminate unnecessary wastes and help to place the marketing of agricultural products upon a business basis. This is necessary before the producer can receive an equitable value for that which he produces.

#### GRAIN-MARKETING INVESTIGATIONS.

"Up to the present time such investigations of the marketing of corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, and other grains as have been conducted have been carried on under the funds set aside for the project entitled 'Miscellaneous Problems in Marketing and Collaboration.' This was due to the fact that the importance of grain-marketing investigations was not recognized, but because the problems in connection with the inauguration of the work in the marketing of perishables were believed to be more acute.

"The development of the office has now progressed to a point where it is important that grain-marketing work be instituted. The following general topics will serve to indicate the direction which the work will take: Studies of the primary marketing of spring and winter wheat, including especially the uses and abuses of dockage in the first sale and the comparison of results in the case of grain passing from the farmer to the line elevator and to the farmers' mutual elevator; the various methods of marketing corn, both for the domestic and export trade, to be studied and compared and especial attention given to the marketing of southern corn. The crop of the South, in a general way, matures almost 30 days in advance of that of the grain belt, but because of inadequate handling and distributing machinery it is not harvested and gotten onto the market in advance of the huge crop of the Middle West. A distinct and fair commercial advantage is thus lost.

"A study of future grain transactions and exchange practices similar to that which has been conducted in future cotton markets should be undertaken. This will involve, among other things, the determination of the relation of cash prices of wheat to future quotations, the effect of the character of the future contract on prices and especially a study of the benefits of hedging. Other topics include the comparison of the 'spread' in marketing of various grains, with the possible suggestion of methods for its reduction; the investigations of grain-storage practices in primary point and terminal elevators; scalping practices and the function of scalping in the large markets, commission methods in the grain trade; mixing practices at terminal elevators, and the effect of mixing on prices of higher grades; a study and comparison of the various grading and inspection methods in use to determine their relative efficiency in economical marketing; the advisability and desirability of uniform grades; 'inspection in' as compared to 'inspection out'; investigation of the efficiency of farmers' cooperative elevators as compared with private and line elevator systems; warehousing practices in the grain trade; and track selling and the cost of marketing grains by the various methods in vogue.

#### MARKET-INFORMATION SERVICE.

"The project entitled 'Market surveys, methods, and costs' embraces a number of those phases of the work of the office in which the public has manifested universal interest and to which the shippers of perishable products look for the earliest and most tangible results. There is a general feeling that this office should build up an information service, both as to crop movement, market receipts, and prices, which will be prompt enough to give to the entire shipping public the facts which are now available only to the larger distributing organizations, and which each obtains for itself at an excessive cost. We plan to institute a series of reports day by day of car-lot movements of specific crops out of certain important producing districts, reporting the destinations and the movements from diverting points as far as practicable. This information can be obtained from many important transportation lines and their agents, and it is of the greatest importance, especially to shippers of perishable products, to know what is going out simultaneously from competing producing areas. A general dissemination of this information must result in a wiser distribution, in fewer needlessly glutted markets, and in more uniform and fairer prices in all the markets. Much of this information, so far as it relates to perishable products, will ultimately have to be handled telegraphically if it is to be an effective instrument in the improvement of marketing conditions and the stabilizing of prices.

"This is a work which can not be done on a very small scale. If undertaken at all, it must cover at least the commercial movement of one entire crop. This means that there must be

a considerable office force ready to give instant attention to the telegraphic information and to compile it and prepare it for telegraphic release with the least possible loss of time. Fortunately, the office force and equipment which will make possible the handling of one crop will also enable the department to handle several crops coming on the market in succession. It will, however, require a somewhat larger field force to secure the necessary information on the movement of four crops than on the movement of one. True economy will, therefore, be effected if the technical field force is increased to the point where it can check up all the information which is being received and tabulated in the office.

"This service to accomplish its greatest good must be supplemented by a system of disinterested reports on conditions existing in the principal distributing centers where the car-lot shipments are inspected and sold. The department must know the actual prices paid for specific typical cars of produce, must have its own information on their condition, and must be able to furnish disinterested information and advice which will enable shippers to improve the quality and condition of their products on arrival, thus insuring better prices. A study of the quotation machinery of many of the important markets has shown that the shipper receives little useful information from such figures as are furnished him.

"The office has already the nucleus of the necessary force, made up of men who have had experience at both the producing and distributing end, several of whom have made a special study of terminal market conditions in a number of our most important cities during the present year.

"The increased amount included in the bill which it is planned to expend in this work is not sufficient to establish a comprehensive price-reporting service for the entire country or for all products, but will finance a sufficient field and office force and provide for enough telegraphic service to handle about four products which succeed each other in the markets and which are shipped over long distances.

"The logical development of this service will inevitably cost money, but it will as certainly assist in securing a better distribution and more economical marketing of farm products, and is the only means yet devised or suggested which promises to reduce the number or frequency of glutted markets. The increase for this phase of the work is confidently recommended as an investment which will yield immediate and profitable returns.

"The investigations of the Office of Markets and Rural Organization so far attempted have opened a wide field of study, suggestion, and field demonstration along the line of grading, packing, standardizing, distributing, and marketing of practically all our farm products. The economical feeding of the Nation demands that intelligent help be given both the producers and consumers along these lines. The present force of this office is wholly inadequate, both as to numbers and equipment, to undertake the lines of work that seem most urgent, to say nothing of the constant requests of producers and consumers from all over the land for assistance along their own special lines."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is clearly new legislation, and he sustains the point of order against it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among farmers in the United States in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities; to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by the research, experimental, and demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and State experiment stations, \$35,920.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. This item, Mr. Chairman, provides in part for a diffusion amongst the people of the United States of "useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by the research, experimental, and demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and State experiment stations," and the appropriation provided is \$35,920.

I desire to comment upon this paragraph in order to have the committee thoroughly understand the difference between this kind of an appropriation and the appropriations contained in a bill that was recently before the House and which has now gone to another body, where it is threatened with destruction because

it is a so-called "pork-barrel bill." The rivers and harbors bill which passed this House, and which was subjected to a very close scrutiny, had the interest of no salaried officers of this Government, save those, perhaps, who are employed in the War Department in the Corps of Engineers; and I venture to say that no man will contradict me in the statement that not one of those engineers had anything to do with the passage of the rivers and harbors bill because their salaries were involved.

Their salaries are assured under the general operation of the War Department, and it would avail them nothing to lobby the bill through this House.

The river and harbor bill provided a total appropriation of \$31,000,000 to carry on a great structural work of the Government, involving the employment of labor in every section of the country and in every State of the Union. That was work that meant the making of revenues for the Government and an increase in the business and the material of the Government. I call attention to that work now threatened with destruction and contrast it with this bill, because we here propose to appropriate approximately \$36,000 of a total of \$22,000,000 for a purpose which is so built up in words that as we read it we have to pause to understand what it means: To diffuse—not to work, not to labor, not to construct, not to create revenue, but to diffuse—among the people of the United States "useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by research, experiment," and so forth. This means brains, for sure, against—

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman argue that that information should be boxed up rather than diffused?

Mr. MOORE. Not at all. It may be very valuable information, but I question whether it can be placed in the same relation with the labor-creating work, with the constructive work, with the revenue-producing work, with the trade-promoting work, contemplated in the river and harbor bill, which has been subjected to very great abuse in both bodies of the National Congress and before the people.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The purpose of river and harbor construction is to carry trade, ultimately, is it not?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Does not the gentleman think this will go hand in hand, finding markets for these farmers, so that they can use these boats to carry their produce?

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in that, and I want to say that these two lines of work should go hand in hand; but I am making this criticism because there seems to be a tremendous influence in Washington that is able to carry through an Agricultural bill, while there are no salaried officers in various branches of the Government, scientists and experimenters, as it were, to stand behind the river and harbor bill. And say what you please as to the river and harbor bill, there is no lobby in Washington made up of men paid by the Government of the United States to urge it forward. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few observations on this paragraph, which provides for the study of cooperation among farmers and the diffusion of knowledge resulting from that study. And in doing so I call attention of the committee to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] a few moments ago, and which I fear was not understood or appreciated by the members of this committee.

To my mind no more important amendment has been offered in the whole course of this discussion, nor is there a more important section in this bill than the section now under consideration. As the gentleman from Texas suggested, it is all very well for the Department of Agriculture to teach farmers how to raise more crops, but larger crops do little good if those crops and the profits of them are taken from the farmers by combinations and monopolies in the market place. The gentleman's suggestion that there ought to be an exchange operated by the Government which would make the transfer of the farmers' products directly to the consumer without graft or the exaction of undue profit is the most valuable suggestion yet made in the whole consideration of this bill. There is not an open market place in the whole United States for the great staple products of wheat, corn, oats, barley, and cotton. There is no place where they can be dealt with as merchandise upon their intrinsic value. The Chamber of Commerce of Minneapolis, the Board of Trade at Chicago, and such organizations elsewhere have a grip upon the market place under existing laws that makes it utterly impossible for the farmers' produce to get a square deal; and if this Government had wisdom, it

would create for the benefit of the farmers of this entire Nation an exchange, an open market place, where the gamblers would not be permitted to destroy values during the seasons when the farmers must sell, and would not be permitted to exploit the consumer all the time by making the spread between the farmer's price and the consumer's price wider than it should be.

I repeat that if there was a Government exchange operating honestly, the farmers would get more for their produce and the consumers would pay less for what they have to buy in order to live. Yet this important amendment went out on a point of order; and gentlemen on this floor hardly stopped conversation to listen to its being read, and gave it no consideration whatever while its author was making its meaning clear and urging its passage.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Agriculture for making this point of order, because I recognize the fact that the able chairman of this committee has been working along the line of marketing; but I insist that if this House did its full duty it would pass this amendment as separate legislation. It is more important than this subdivision of the bill under consideration; infinitely more important than that of experimental farms and of scientific farming, elsewhere provided for, because, unless you make the market place an honest place and guard against price manipulation and control, the amount of the crop, the skill in raising it, the transportation problems, and other reforms all go for nothing, and all of the profit is reaped, as I deliberately say it has been for over a quarter of a century, by gamblers in the pit, so-called future traders in cotton and grain, who do not steady the market, as claimed, but rather make it fluctuate and change to serve their gambling purposes. When this great Agricultural Committee and this House acquire sufficient comprehension of the great problem of marketing and learn its evils they will destroy future trading as a first step and then make the market an honest, fair, and open market. When they do this and provide a system of honest inspection this House and this committee will be serving this entire Nation to a degree that they have not yet approached in the consideration of agricultural legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. In view of the appointment of a commission to visit Europe to investigate the matter, and the further fact that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and Senate have prepared bills on this subject, what is the necessity of this paragraph with reference to rural credits?

Mr. LEVER. This item is for the study not only of rural credits but of other means of cooperation among the rural population—the study of rural insurance; the study of rural communication; and other problems of rural cooperation.

I think they have only one man in the department now who is studying rural credits, and I heard the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOSS], who knows as much about this subject as any man, say that this gentleman's presentation of it to the Banking and Currency Committee was the strongest presentation made at all.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. I want to ask a few questions of the gentleman. The Secretary of Agriculture in his report for 1914, on page 26, used this language:

There seems to be no emergency which requires or justifies Government assistance to the farmers directly through the use of the Government's cash or the Government's credit.

Then he goes on further, and uses this language:

It is the judgment of the best students of economic conditions here that there is need to supplement existing agencies—a proper land-mortgage banking system, operating through private funds, just as other banking institutions operate, and this judgment is shared by the leaders of economic thought abroad.

Now, the Secretary seems to have all the information he wishes to form an opinion as to the character of the banks that ought to be established. Why make an appropriation for a subject which the Secretary has expressed an opinion on already.

Mr. LEVER. The judgment of the Secretary is not going to control the expert information gathered under this appropriation. I do not know personally whether the gentleman referred to a moment ago by me—Mr. Thompson, I think his name was—concurs with the Secretary in that regard or not. I have not discussed it with him because it does not come under my jurisdiction.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, there was an appropriation of \$50,000 carried for this identical purpose, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, the current year, there was an appropriation of \$200,000 carried for this purpose.



Mr. LEVER. Not for this purpose. This is an item carried separately, a separate item in the bill that has been transferred to this work.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. It covers the same subject matter.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is mistaken; the first appropriation for the Office of Markets carried \$50,000, and there was a separate item of \$40,000 for this work, and now they have combined the two under one management.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars has been appropriated.

Mr. LEVER. Not for the study of rural credits, but for the general problem of marketing, and so forth.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. The Secretary of Agriculture seems to have formed a definite opinion as to rural-credit institutions that ought to be established.

Mr. LEVER. This is not all for the study of rural credits.

Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma. As I understand it covers all the items contained in rural credits and other forms of co-operation in rural communities. It covers the items on pages 70 and 71 down to line 19. But that \$250,000 has been carried in a previous bill and covers these two items.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is a waste of the people's money to make this appropriation for the Department of Agriculture to experiment on the subject of rural credits and marketing farm products. Before an effective system of marketing farm products can be established it is necessary that we establish a system of rural credits which will supply the farmers of the country with money on long time at a low rate of interest. A banking and currency system for the farmers is just the opposite of a banking and currency system for those engaged in commercial pursuits. A commercial banker is engaged in congregating the money of a community in a common fund to be loaned to the people of that community. These funds are taken by the bank as demand deposits, and necessarily the bank must be in position to repay these deposits at any time they are called for. This renders it necessary for the banks to loan on short time, upon such security as will insure the payment of the obligation at maturity. In other words, the bank can only deal in paper having an early maturity, and known in commercial banking as liquid assets—that is, commercial paper which can at any time be converted into money. On the other hand, the function of a rural credit system of banking is to assemble the assets of a community and secure an advance of money on them. One is to assemble the money and loan it; the other to assemble the securities and secure money on them. The commercial banker must loan for a high rate of interest on short time, while the farmer must secure his money for a long time at a low rate of interest. Both the Moss-Fletcher bill and the Bulkley-Hollis bill provide a system of rural-credit banks to be incorporated under the terms of the different acts, privately owned and controlled. These systems would necessarily be conducted for dividend purposes, and this would defeat the whole purpose of a rural-credit banking system, which is to lower interest rates to the farmers. The more I have thought on this subject the more I have become convinced that the whole subject ought to be taken in hand directly by the Government, without the intervention of banks of any character, even though the banks should be organized and financed by the Government.

I have arrived at this conclusion: First, by reason of the great cost of establishing and maintaining such a system as provided in the Moss-Fletcher and the Bulkley-Hollis bills would entail, which cost, of course, would have to be paid by the borrowers and would to that extent increase the interest rate; and second, because of the red tape that would be encountered by the farmers when they applied for a loan. Only last fall, when the cotton farmers of the South were forced to sustain a loss of nearly \$400,000,000, and from \$30,000,000 to \$35,000,000 of this loss fell on the Oklahoma farmers, a pool of \$135,000,000 was raised to loan them on their cotton. It was announced that the amount of the loan would be \$30 per bale at 6 per cent interest, running for one year, with the privilege of renewal at the option of the borrower for an additional period of six months. When the fund had been subscribed and the promise of great relief was made to the farmers the Federal Reserve Board so hedged the fund about with restrictions and regulations and red tape that only \$12,000 of that vast sum that promised so much relief has been applied for. The newspapers on yesterday carried a news item that the pool was to be dissolved on February 1. The item reads:

COTTON FUND TO END FEBRUARY 1—RESERVE BOARD BELIEVES LOAN PLAN HAS ACCOMPLISHED ITS PURPOSE.

Unless there is an unexpected increase in the demand for loans the \$135,000,000 cotton loan fund will end its existence shortly after Feb-

ruary 1. Then subscriptions of banks through the North, West, and East will be canceled and southern bankers and cotton men left to finance the surplus crop in their own way.

Up to date applications for loans from the fund amount to about \$12,000, and officials here say they have no reason to believe that there will be any more applications before the period for making them expires, February 1.

Members of the Federal Reserve Board said yesterday that, in spite of the few applications, the loan fund had done its work in keeping up the confidence of the cotton men at a time when confidence was needed.

The rules and regulations concerning the loaning of this fund were such that the farmer—the actual producer—could not take advantage of it. One of the regulations governing the fund was that no loan be made on cotton in less than 100-bale lots. This regulation necessarily precluded the actual producer, except in rare instances, from securing the benefits of the fund. For this reason I foresee that the borrower will obtain little relief from any system of rural-credit banking that is enmeshed by a lot of red tape and numberless rules and regulations prepared by clerks and janitors who feel that they must add dignity to their positions.

I heard the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] discuss his bill the other day, and I see no reason why the plan he outlined is not practicable and feasible. It provides a farm-loan department in one of the bureaus here in Washington, and the gentleman from Arkansas, in discussing the bill and outlining its provisions, said:

To procure a loan under the provisions of this bill all the machinery for its operation is local. The farmer desiring a loan would apply to his postmaster, who would appoint two committees of people residing in his community, and these committees would appraise the lands at their fair value, and the improvements would also be appraised at their fair value, but separately. These appraisements would be turned in to the postmaster, and the postmaster and the chairman of the two committees would revise the appraisement and forward to the commission at Washington, and from that appraisement the amount to which the applicant is entitled would be determined. The title to the lands would be determined by an abstract furnished by the applicant and examined without cost by an agent of the Government. If the Torrens system of registration of land title prevailed, the certificate of the State is made, under this bill, sufficient evidence of title. Inasmuch as that system is so much cheaper and safer than abstracts and title guarantees, this bill would hasten the day when all States would adopt that system of land registration. The loans are to be guaranteed by the Government, though the Government would put no actual capital in the system. It guarantees the repayment of these loans as it guarantees the circulating medium of the national banks and Federal reserve notes. It does under this for the farmer only what it has done for the merchant, doctor, banker, lawyer, and manufacturer in the banking laws as they are now written. An applicant for a loan under the provisions of the bill does not name the rate of interest, but his securities are placed on the market and sold at par to the one who is willing to accept them at the lowest rate of interest, thereby putting the farmer in touch with trust funds and savings-bank accounts and all moneys that are seeking an absolutely safe long-time loan and would procure for the farmer as low rate of interest as the bonds of our Government command in any market of the world. Not only will it attract domestic capital, but foreign capital willing to invest in our Government bonds would be willing and anxious to invest in these securities and at the same rate of interest. In addition to the interest that the farmer will be compelled to pay, he will pay some per cent to be determined by the commissioners as an amortization fund, which fund will be a trust fund held in the Treasury, to be deposited in banks or loaned, as the commission may prescribe. The holders of the securities may cash their interest coupons at interest-paying dates at any post office or national bank in any State or Territory of these United States.

These funds are exempt from taxation in exactly the same way and for the same reason that the Federal reserve act exempts from taxation the resources of the regional and member banks. The security upon which the loan rests will have been taxed in the community where it is situated, and to tax the loan would be double taxation, and therefore increase the rate of interest the farmer would be compelled to pay.

The bill provides, further, that the loans shall be issued in series of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, or 30 years, at the option of the borrower, but where a loan is for a period greater than five years the borrower has the right at any interest-paying period to pay the entire indebtedness or \$100 or any multiple thereof, and on the sums so paid all interest payments will cease.

Until a successful system of rural-credit banks is established it is idle to talk about establishing a system of marketing farm products, for the reason that as long as the farmer is compelled to pay the heavy rates of interest which he is forced to pay in Oklahoma, and which run from 10 to 36 per cent, he is forced as soon as his crops mature to throw the same on the market, no matter what price he may obtain therefor, in order to pay his banker or his merchant, who have carried him for the amount he owes them, and thereby stop the accumulation of interest. If a successful system of rural credit banks is established so that the farmer can secure money on his assets on long time at a reasonable rate of interest, he will be in position to withhold from the market his products and sell them as the consumer's needs demand, thereby cutting out the profit of the middleman, and enabling the actual producer to secure the full value of the product of his toil. The object of a rural credit system of banking is to put the farmer in direct touch with the man who has money to loan and cut out the profit of the middleman, enabling the farmer to secure money on the same terms that those engaged in commercial pursuits now ob-

tain it, and the object of the bureau of marketing farm products is to enable the farmer to sell direct to the consumer, thereby cutting out the profits of the middleman and secure the full value of the crops which he produces.

I am convinced that the Government could not exercise its activities in a line fraught with more good to our country than by establishing both these systems. In 1913 Congress remained in extra session from April 7 until the convening of the regular session in December in order to perfect a system of banking and currency which would afford relief to the commercial interests of our country. The Democratic platform at Baltimore declared:

Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits or agricultural finance. Therefore we recommend that an investigation of agricultural credit societies in foreign countries be made, so that it may be ascertained whether a system of rural credits may be devised suitable to conditions in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of making good our promises to the people of this country. I can not understand how Members of this House, who vote for an Army appropriation bill carrying, in round numbers, \$130,000,000; a Navy appropriation bill carrying \$148,000,000, in round numbers; a rivers and harbors bill carrying \$34,000,000, in round numbers; and for every bill which increases the appropriation for salaries of Government employees, vote against every proposition advanced for the benefit of the American farmer, on whose back every one of these different organizations ride.

I am not in favor of, nor does the farmer desire, any special privilege in this country, but when we can appropriate \$35,000,000 to build a railroad in Alaska—\$1,000 for each person in that far-distant Territory—and \$40,000,000 to build or purchase ships to carry the commerce of our country on the high seas, it does seem to me that those who ask us to so vote ought to be willing to vote to assist more than 40 per cent of the people—the farmers—when they are threatened with financial ruin and bankruptcy. I shall continue to vote against the Army, the Navy, and the rivers and harbors bills, as well as all other appropriation bills, until the farmers and producers of this country receive justice at the hands of the Congress.

I hope an extra session will be held in 1915 to grant the same relief to the farmers and producers of the country as was given the commercial and banking interests in 1913. I am willing and anxious, though I have been here now nearly constantly for the past two years, to remain another year in order to perfect the rural credit banking system and the marketing of farm products system, which I regard as absolutely necessary to the future prosperity of our country. I therefore indulge the hope that the President will call an extra session of Congress to perfect these bills and grant relief to the farmers of the United States from the extortionate rates of interest which they have been compelled to pay by dividing the profits of their toil with the middlemen.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say what is in the minds of all here, that the expenses of this Government finally rests on the backs of the tillers of the soil, and that they expect us to vote and speak for them. So long as they honor me with a seat in this House I shall raise my voice and cast my vote as will most promote their interest and their prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, \$352,650.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 71, line 19, insert the following:

"NATIONAL MARKETING COMMISSION.

"That the President be authorized to appoint a national marketing commission, to be composed of nine members, five of whom shall be engaged in agricultural or horticultural pursuits and four of whom shall be selected with special reference to their knowledge of commerce, finance, transportation, and law, and who shall receive compensation not in excess of \$7,500 each per annum.

"And furthermore, that said commission shall meet in the city of Washington, at a time designated by the President, to organize by the election of officers and to adopt a plan of action for the effective organization of the States, counties, and localities of the United States, to the end of securing the economic distribution of the products of the farm, orchard, and garden.

"Said commission shall, furthermore, be empowered and directed to act with such organizations and individuals as may elect to become part of the national marketing system, when such organizations and individuals may have been authorized by said commission to cooperate to that end."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, to that I reserve a point of order. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, there are three gentlemen who want to be heard on this proposition; and, while it is getting late and I am anxious to get through with the bill, I think, in courtesy to them, I shall ask that all debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, it is the intention of the gentleman to ask that the committee sit in session until the bill is finished and to pass it to-night?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How many more amendments of this character, which they know will not go into the bill, but upon which they want to talk, are to be offered?

Mr. LEVER. I know of no more that will provoke discussion. I have one committee amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject, I want to say that I have an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me that we ought to get through by 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. I thought we ought to have finished the bill by 3 or 4 o'clock, but I am perfectly willing to stay.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman understands that I am anxious to finish the bill, but the bill is made up in such a way that I am at the mercy of these gentlemen.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I do not think that; but I think we ought to have a reasonable discussion.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will go out on a point of order, but I desire to thank the chairman for his generosity in giving 15 minutes to the discussion of the proposed amendment.

The Agricultural Department has done much in the past few years in speeding the farmer up to a greater production in the output of the soil. He has been taught to make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. But little has been done to find a market for the product of the farm. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and others who have preceded me have made appropriate remarks by saying, substantially, that every bushel of corn or potatoes or product of the farm or the garden that may go to waste is paid for by somebody in the centers of population. The trouble with this country, of course, is that we have not the cooperative spirit that obtains in the European countries, and especially among the German people. We have been taught to rely entirely upon our individual efforts. Individualism has been accentuated and emphasized in this country to the exclusion of cooperation. Now, I know this proposed amendment will go out upon the point of order reserved by the chairman, but I have an object in this as well as the other Members who are desirous of addressing the committee. I want to lay stress upon and emphasize as much as possible the great importance of this matter, in order that the same may be crystallized in the minds of the membership of this House as well as the incoming Congress.

We are in great need of something like this. Now the joint resolution 344 was not the product of my imagination altogether. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORRIS] and other Members of the House, Senator FLETCHER and one or two other Members of the Senate, as well as Mr. Lubin, including Dr. Owen, the secretary of the Southern Commercial Congress, got together and thought out this resolution, and I was selected to introduce it. This proposed resolution now before the committee, however, is a substitute for the resolution, because it was thought by its friends to be more practicable at this time.

The bill before the committee at this time goes only to the extent of "acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products, and the purchasing of farm supplies," and so forth.

I appreciate the necessity of acquiring necessary data and proper diffusion of the same among the people, but data and statistics alone will not bring relief either to the people who grow surplus agricultural products or to the consumer thereof. What we need is not so much data, but the inauguration of a movement whereby the producer and consumer may be brought into closer relationship, to the extent that many of the middlemen now making fabulous fortunes off products of the country may be eliminated, thereby causing the grower of agricultural products to obtain a higher price than he is now receiving and at the same time permitting the consumers of these products—the people who reside in cities and crowded centers—to purchase the same at a cost less than now obtains.

I am not informed as to the value of agricultural products that annually go to waste by an improper distribution, but it runs, I am quite sure from the best information I can gather,



into hundreds of millions of dollars. In addition all of this waste is not an additional loss. The producer of many of the articles that are marketed receives an inadequate price therefor, not only on account of the intervention of so many middle men, but for the further reason that without a coherent system the farmer does not know of a market for the sale of his stuff.

Those of us who have been observers know that without a system of marketing and cooperation many products reach a city only to find that city overcrowded with a great surplus of similar products, with the result that if a sale is effected it will be a sacrifice, and frequently the price obtained is insufficient to pay the transportation charges. Speaking concretely, I recall in my own county several years ago many of the farmers there undertook to diversify their crops, and with a degree of cooperation in the raising of Irish potatoes. They set to work early in the spring, planted their potatoes, reaped an early harvest, and put the same upon the market in St. Louis and elsewhere, with the result that few of them, as I recall, received enough for their potatoes to pay the railroad transportation charges. These products reached their destination only to find that the market was flooded, so to speak, with potatoes that had just been received a day or so before.

Now, such a thing as this would not happen if we had a national marketing commission, properly linked and correlated with similar State, county, and local organizations, all working and cooperating to a general purpose to find a market for everything to be marketed at the best price to be obtained, and with as little cost as possible for transportation charges, and thus bringing more nearly together the producer and consumer.

I have been told by several of the Members from the California delegation that a number of years ago tens of thousands of California fruit of all kinds were thrown overboard into the Pacific Ocean to be disposed of for the reason that a market could not be found for these products, and when a thing like this happens the farmer who loses his vegetables, his potatoes, corn, or what not, is not the only loser; the people who are compelled to buy these things, on account of this loss, are thereby forced to pay a higher price for that which they purchased on account of this loss.

I know of no two subjects that so vitally affect the great masses of the people of this country, especially the great farming class of people, who, by their toil, feed and clothe the world, as a failure for the Congress to provide a proper national marketing commission, such as this amendment of mine proposes to create, and another as well—a failure to enact a proper rural-credit law to enable the farmer to borrow money at a low rate of interest on a long-time loan, that his farm may be improved, ditches, fences, and houses constructed, as well as the purchase of the necessary live stock that he may thus have an investment to operate upon.

Our agricultural people can not prosper as they should if both these important factors, so necessary in their life, are to be continued to be denied. These two legislative demands are necessary for their prosperity.

It is not sufficient, I say, that a man may be able to borrow money for a period from 6 to 12 months only, as it would be impossible for him within this time to make the improvements to which I have just referred. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend at this juncture to lay such great stress upon the subject of rural credit, as important as that subject is, but to speak more directly to the pending amendment, and to the bill itself; but in passing I will say that my disappointment has been great, and I know dozens of other Members of this House share with me the same disappointment, that we have not been able to give to the people not only one but both of these measures—a rural-credit law as well as a national marketing commission. The people have a right to not only expect one but both of these, and if Congress continues to refuse to grant these demands it will continue to earn the displeasure and disappointment of the people.

But from this digression I revert to the subject at hand. I wish every Member of Congress could have heard the argument made by Hon. David Lubin before the House Committee on Agriculture September 14, 1914, on House joint resolution 344, introduced by me on September 10, as I now recall, the pending amendment which I am just now discussing being a modification of this other resolution of mine, House joint resolution 344.

Mr. Lubin, as you recall, gentlemen, is the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture, which sits permanently at Rome, Italy. It was Mr. Lubin who conceived, or dreamed, so to speak, of this great institute to which the United States and all the other nations of the world, except two or

three of the smaller countries, some years ago entered into a treaty or convention, and all of these are represented in this institute.

Mr. Lubin returned from Italy last August and was in Washington about seven weeks, and it was my pleasure to be with him a good part of every day, and I was selected by him and others to introduce House joint resolution 344, and I am sorry indeed that the Agricultural Committee, owing to the shortness of time since then, has not been able to give proper investigation to this matter and to report out a bill on same. It is in substance a resolution creating a national marketing commission.

For the past 10 years Mr. Lubin has been in Rome as the American delegate to this International Institute of Agriculture. He is not there for the small salary that he receives, because he made the remark to the President of the United States in my presence, when I accompanied him to see the President about this and another matter, that he spent six or seven times the salary he receives.

It seems Mr. Lubin is a man of considerable means, and by no means is he dependent upon his salary, which is \$3,600 per annum, and the work already accomplished by him in behalf of his own country would immortalize him, not to mention the great world-wide work he is doing as a member of this institute, which, so to speak, acts as a great clearing house to the world on all matters pertaining to agriculture.

Practically all of the European countries have a marketing commission in one form or another, and most of them are modeled after the German system, which, as stated in the outset of my remarks a few moments ago, alone is largely responsible for the great strength in arms which Germany is to-day displaying to the world. Very little, if anything, of any value whatsoever goes to waste in Germany. There is no such thing over there as a trust in food products. The cooperative spirit there is probably not equaled elsewhere in the world, and if our country is to ever take her place, as in time she must, we, too, must be more cooperative and less selfish than we are.

We must learn that we are in a measure our brother's keeper; that each of us does not live for himself alone; that as our neighbors prosper we, too, may prosper, and that out of a just and friendly cooperation grows concord, agreement, and mutuality; that those giant aggregations of wealth, centered in a few hands which we call the trust, have long enough devoured the substance of the people, and that such institutions are made possible largely by our own selfishness and lack of cooperation; that the more we pull apart and have dissension in our own ranks the more readily the enemy enters the camp, taking always advantage of any mutiny that may exist.

House joint resolution 344, above referred to, and introduced by me, has received wide advertisement, I think largely through the efforts of Mr. Lubin in the State of California, which is his home State. I have received many letters in the past few weeks from all parts of that great State from all kinds of organizations, societies, and associations, as well as from individuals, farmers, fruit and truck growers, and the like, and many of the Members of the California delegation have received like letters, all urging that this resolution of mine, referred to, pass at this session of Congress; and I ask, Mr. Chairman, that as a sample of these letters I may have printed in the Record three communications, one of which, from Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, of that State, has just been a few moments ago received by me, and the other two received by me on yesterday, and I herewith submit the same to be printed.

The letters referred to are as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1915.

Hon. W. S. GOODWIN, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GOODWIN: The men and women of California are beginning a Nation-wide campaign for the furtherance of H. J. Res. No. 344, the national marketing commission resolution which you introduced. They feel that this commission will be an important factor for the entire country, especially from an economic standpoint. It is a question that will vitally affect many phases of our existence, and among those most interested in its successful working out will be the producer, the consumer, the public carrier, the realty man, and others.

As you have stood sponsor for the resolution, we will be glad to hear from you in regard to suggestions for a campaign. To whom shall we appeal expecting assistance, and to whom, if any, shall we look for opposition?

To begin our campaign we held a public mass meeting, at which the resolution and proposed bill was indorsed by Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, its president-elect speaking for it from the platform; the public carriers, with representatives from the Pacific Electric and Salt Lake Railroads; the Well-Fargo Express; and the parcels post, in which the postmaster represented the carrier. A letter from E. P. Ripley, president of the Santa Fe, also indorsed the work, and was read from the platform that night.

The man who organized the first cooperative citrus association in the State, 23 years ago, represented the producer, the head of one of the largest and most influential produce exchange houses in the West, declared unequivocally in favor of the bill, and the attitude of the

consumer was presented by a woman who had been instrumental in establishing the municipal markets in the city.

The Outlook Association's campaign has been indorsed by the following local organizations: The chamber of commerce, all of the chambers on the Pacific coast, except one which we have been unable to reach; the realty board; the City Club, 600 members; the Friday Morning Club, 1,500 members; the Ebell Club, 1,500 members; the Evening City Club, 400 members; the Woman's Civic Club, 200 members; the Municipal League; the Woman's Republican League, and many others of importance.

In addition to these commendations, the chairman of the committee received this morning the most enthusiastic and unqualified indorsement from Gov. Johnson, a copy of which is inclosed to you.

For creating national interest in this campaign there are committees appointed as follows—and their political characteristics are noted that you may see at once the absolutely nonpartisan nature of the campaign:

Mrs. D. C. McCan, Democrat, chairman of campaign committee; Department of National Housewives League, Mrs. Edwin T. Earl, Progressive—wife of Progressive editor; Federation of State Societies, James R. H. Wagner, Republican; Interstate Woman's Committee, Mrs. Frank E. Wolfe, Socialist; National Legislation, Miss Mary Foy, Democrat; State Legislation, Mrs. Seward Simon, Republican; Public Carriers, Mrs. James F. Scherfee, Progressive; Membership, Mrs. E. C. Bellows, Republican; National Federation of Woman's Clubs, Mrs. R. J. Waters, Democrat; Speakers and Meetings, Mrs. W. C. Tyler, Democrat; Finance, Dr. John R. Haines, Progressive; Landowners, Mrs. Harriet Barry, Progressive; Distribution of Literature, Mrs. William Carnes, Republican.

Letters have been sent to all the registered agricultural organizations in the State and to the organizations represented in these committees. All the members of the house and senate and the members of the committee on agriculture as well as the gentlemen present at the hearing on September 14, 1914, have also been notified of our undertaking.

Awaiting your reply, we are,

Yours, very truly,

OUTLOOK ASSOCIATION,

Mrs. JAS. F. SCHERFEE,

President.

Mrs. DAVID C. MCCAN,

Chairman of Campaign Committee.

JANUARY 23, 1915.

Hon. W. S. GOODWIN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The Outlook Association of California has begun a state-wide campaign for the purpose of furthering H. J. Res. 344, and it asks that you at once make known to the members of the Committee on Agriculture your interest in the resolution and your desire that it be brought out of committee at once and given an opportunity for favorable action at this session.

Indorsements of the Outlook Association's campaign in this work have been received from every chamber of commerce on the Pacific coast except one, which we have not been able to reach—from the president of the Santa Fe Railway; E. P. Ripley, from the Salt Lake Railway; the Pacific Electric Railway; the Wells-Fargo and parcel post representatives; the Realty Board; the Municipal League; the City Club, 700 members; Friday Morning Club, 1,500 members; the Ebell Club, 1,500 members; the Federation of Poultry Growers of Southern California, 500 members; Women's Republican League; Business Women's Civil League; and many others of importance.

In addition we received this morning an enthusiastic letter from Gov. Hiram W. Johnson, a copy of which we inclose, giving his unqualified indorsement to the campaign and to the proposed national marketing commission.

In speaking of this matter to your associates it might be well to remind them that these indorsements are all from voters, and that we who represent them in this campaign will be glad to know of their attitude in regard to this important resolution, upon which we want your immediate active cooperation.

Very truly, yours,

THE OUTLOOK ASSOCIATION.

Mrs. JAS. F. SCHERFEE, President.

Mrs. DAVID C. MCCAN, Chairman.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,

Sacramento, January 23, 1915.

Mrs. DAVID C. MCCAN,

Chairman Campaign Committee, The Outlook Association,  
Los Angeles, Cal.

DEAR MADAM: I gladly avail myself of this opportunity to express my earnest hope that House joint resolution 344, providing for a national marketing commission, will be adopted by Congress, and I also wish to commend you personally for your activity in behalf of this measure.

I am keenly interested in the problem of marketing farm products, and I take it that the resolution now pending at Washington is a step toward solving it. In California our farmers have, in some instances, demonstrated signally what can be accomplished, for the benefit both of the producer and the consumer when intelligent methods of marketing are introduced. Speaking generally, however, the agriculturists labor under serious disadvantages in this particular that imperatively demand correction. The farming industry has failed to receive, probably more than any other, the aid of governmental functions. Such a body as a national marketing commission could, I am sure, perform a great service to the country.

Please accept my thanks for honoring me with your request for an expression of my opinion for, if it can avail anything to help you in your cause, I shall, because of my deep interest in the matter, feel grateful to have had the opportunity to lend a helping hand.

Sincerely,

HIRAM W. JOHNSON, Governor.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. You will see from two of these letters, Mr. Chairman, that divers and sundry organizations have indorsed this resolution, and among these are many women's clubs, political, social, business, agricultural, and others have indorsed this resolution.

The good women in that State are cooperating with the men in bringing about a better condition of affairs. They have many hundreds of organizations working to this end, to the end that not only their own lot may be made better, but likewise the lot of their children and grandchildren and neighbors may likewise be made better.

That man serves himself best who serves the world best, because "no man liveth unto himself alone."

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if this amendment were not to be ruled out on a point of order, I am not sure that at the present time I should be advocating it. I am here on this floor at the present time to emphasize the necessity of correlating all information that may lead to the marketing of crops and to the saving of waste. In my experience—and I believe individual experience is best worth while as illustrative—I can sell beef from the range but two months in the year. I can not sell beef any other months of the year because my beef comes off grass and is only good those months. If I tried to send to the eastern market the beef killed on my range, I would find that the local markets in the East could not afford to buy from me, because I could only furnish them for two months in the year.

If others could supplement for the rest of the year, we could furnish cheap and good meat all the year around under existing conditions. Retailers must buy from sources that can furnish them all the year around, and therefore unless I can market my beef locally I must sell my cattle off the range for feeders. This is but one of the propositions that is up to me and to every other producer, this question of the economic waste due to the lack of a coherent system of marketing. As a boy in California I continually saw the most outrageous waste of product. Fruit was dumped overboard into San Francisco Bay, and it bobbed with wasted produce. All over this country to-day we find that produce is going to waste simply because people do not know how or where they can market their output. The remedy that is proposed under this bill seems to me inadequate. The amendment is a forward vision.

This amendment will lead to a system which, working toward complete distribution, would carry with it merely the expense of a central body, which body will cooperate through the States and through the counties down to the smallest districts, and will work with all the machinery furnished by the granges and other farmers' organizations. It is our duty to know how we may place products where they are needed at the lowest possible cost. When we passed a bill the other day to standardize the apple barrel we were working exactly along this line of marketing and of creating standards. We must find out where products are and where there is a market for them. We must standardize the qualities and the packing of products. We must learn the freight rates and distribute the information, and show whether products can or can not be exported from the place of their origin. In so doing, in furnishing information, in establishing standards, we shall afford this country the greatest possible service. We shall provide against waste, and in so doing we shall practically duplicate our productivity. By the simple process of bringing producer and consumer together we shall more than double the beneficence of production. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I have any of my time left, I yield it to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I most heartily support this amendment, and I wish that the amendment might be permitted to come squarely before the committee at this time, so that a vote could be taken upon it.

A national marketing commission will be of inestimable value to the country and will fit in splendidly with and properly supplement the local cooperative marketing organizations that are now to be found in many of the States. In the State which I have the honor in part to represent we have a number of local cooperative marketing organizations affiliated with the American Society of Equity and with the National Grange which are doing a very good work in disseminating knowledge concerning market prices to their members and in assisting and directing the farmers to market their products to the best advantage.

This amendment proposes to have established in this country an organization similar in its scope to the Landwirtschaftsrat in Germany. In that country is seen the highest development of cooperation among its people engaged in agriculture. Farming in all its departments has reached a higher degree of development in Germany than in any other country. All of us have seen within the past few months some of the results of Germany's wise agricultural development and great agricultural resources in the manner in which that country has been carrying on its part in the great European war. And



I now venture to say that the remarkable improvement in farming and farm life that has taken place in Germany during the past 70 years and which has been so greatly assisted by the study and attention that has been given to the problems of co-operative marketing of farm products, will be even more strikingly emphasized to the world in the months to come.

The national marketing commission provided for in this amendment would, as part of its work, gather information from the different States of the Union as to the supply and demand for different farm products, and thus be in position to direct local marketing organizations where their farm products might be sent and marketed to the best advantage. To-day in this country such system of farm marketing as we have is an indefensible, archaic system, through which the farmer very often receives but a small portion of what he should receive for his products. In the marketing of wheat by the farmers of my State this year during the months of September, October, and November they received in most cases from 10 to 20 cents a bushel less for their wheat at the time of sale than they should have received and which they would have received if a thoroughly well-organized co-operative marketing system was in operation in this country.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I regret this amendment is subject to a point of order and that a point of order will be made against it. The establishment of a national marketing commission is of the utmost importance to the country. The proposition has been indorsed by nearly all of the farmers and orchardists' associations and by all but one of the chambers of commerce of California, where we know from experience the economic value of cooperation in the distributing and marketing of certain farm products.

Mr. Chairman, in California the citrus fruit and deciduous fruit people have organized voluntary associations which have resulted favorably toward the bringing of good results to the farmers and marketing fruits at a reasonable cost to the consumers. But in the United States in general the system of distributing and marketing farm products is unscientific, wasteful, and uneconomical. The farmer receives less than he should for his products and the consumer pays more than he ought to. How this national marketing commission is expected to correct this condition and benefit the farmer and the consumer and to destroy trusts in food products is best explained by Mr. David Lubin in his own words, and I will send to the desk his statement, which I will ask the Clerk to read in my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WE CAN REDUCE THE COST OF LIVING—SHALL WE?

A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR A NATIONAL MARKETING COMMISSION.

The undue rise in the price of foodstuffs and the evil influences on the economic condition of the people arising therefrom has given, and is now giving us, as a people, an added incentive to find an effective remedy. This remedy should not be of a temporary character, but should be a permanent betterment.

Fortunately we have had living in Rome, Italy, a man who sees things with a world vision, and from that vantage ground has proposed a remedy which will be both effective and permanent.

Mr. David Lubin, in speaking before the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, when the matter of a remedy was under discussion, said:

"On the 3d of October (1914) it will be 10 years that I have been living in Rome as delegate of the United States to the International Institute of Agriculture, and in that capacity the opportunity presented itself for observing the operation of the Landwirtschaftsrat (German Council of Agriculture). This system (of directing the marketing of the products of the soil) is substantially in operation in a number of the continental countries, and is more clearly defined in Germany than in the other countries.

"The more I observed the operation of that system the more I became convinced that its adoption in the United States would promote the economic interests, not merely of the farmers but of the consumers, of all the American people. Yes; it would even transcend the boundary line of economic advantage; it would go beyond that; it would be a political advantage to the American people.

"The American people simply must adapt and adopt the Landwirtschaftsrat, or drift, as old Rome drifted, toward the ultimate fall.

"The President and the people are complaining about the undue rise in the price of the products of the farm; for the undue rise in the price of food products. Well, what is the remedy?

"Will it be to argue with buyers and sellers or to penalize them? I do not think anything can be accomplished in that way. There has been a great talk, and there is a great talk all over the country that the trusts are responsible for the high prices in the cost of food products, for the high cost of living. Well, there is but one effective way to fight the trusts, and that is to take the goods that are trusted out of their reach; that is the way to make the trust impossible, and this is just what I propose under the plan to be set forth."

The plan, in substance, is this:

First. Let the President of the United States appoint a national marketing commission consisting of (a) the president of an influential chamber of commerce; (b) the mayors of three of the largest cities in the Union; (c) three members of the leading mail-order and department stores; (d) a leading railroad man; (e) a parcel-post man; (f) a leading banker; (g) a leading workman; (h) two Congressmen; (i) a Senator; making 14 in all; and in addition to these let the President add 15 farmers from the various sections of the United States.

This committee of 29 would be the national marketing commission, who would meet and organize for the purpose of having the food products in the various States of the Union distributed under the plan that shall be explained further on.

Second. Said national commission shall have prescribed power of direction of similar committees to be appointed by each of the governors in every State in the Union.

Third. Said State commissions shall have power to appoint committees of the same kind for every county in that State, and the county commissions shall have the right to appoint the township committees.

The national commission, after organization, shall devise a plan for the delivery and sale of the products by the farmers or their hired agents. They shall devise plans and specifications and details of sample rooms, auction rooms, exchanges, pits, and street markets, and designate, for the benefit of the producers or their agents, how the products in townships, counties, and States shall be synchronized for shipment, for display, by private sale or by auction, the rules for selling and delivery, the terms of sale and the mode of procedure.

The various commissions appointed are to ask the cooperation and assistance of the press, the carriers, the Federal, State, and county officials, the ministers of the various denominations, the various chambers of commerce and boards of trade, the labor leaders, and the farmers everywhere.

For instance, the products will be synchronized all along the route of the railway and train service will take these products up and deliver them, according to a schedule known beforehand to both the producer and the purchaser, at certain sales places.

Each town and city will have its auction rooms and at almost every hour of the day a different line of produce will be offered for sale. There will be the open-air markets; the cities and towns will designate certain public squares for that purpose, when these public squares will be converted into a market, with a space designated for each seller.

In these markets or exchanges, run by the farmers, under the direction and in accordance with the plans of the different commissions, all the different kinds of farm produce could be put on sale at different hours in the day or week. There would be a time for the sale of potatoes or other root crops; a time for the sale of fruits; a time for tobacco; a time for cereals; a time for cotton, wool, flax, and hides; a time for dairy products and forage; a time for live stock and poultry. Thus every hour in the day these markets or exchanges would be to the agricultural interests of America what the heart is to the human body.

The mode of disposing of farm produce here proposed is not new. It is in operation in almost every country of Europe, and why should it not be in operation in the United States? The old and present system which places the buyer from a wholesaler in direct contact with the producer by bringing him to the farm where the product is grown, is not conducive to the economic welfare of the farmer. On the contrary, under this old system the farmer becomes, as it were, the "under dog," the hungry dog tussling with a bare, gristly bone.

In fact, the close approach of a few large buyers surrounding the districts producing the crops which they wish to purchase may be compared to the besieging of a city by an invading force of irresistible power. Closer and closer these few buyers hem in the farmer in the producing district until, finally closing up the ranks, they stifle all sound commercial practices and instincts in the seller. And thus those few buyers succeed in substantially voting over to themselves, at their own price, the products of the seller.

If we ever have a scientific analysis of the causes which have led up to the formation of the trusts in the United States, it will surely be found that one of the main causes is the seemingly harmless system which places a few large buyers in direct contact with the producers, by bringing them to the farm to purchase the product where it is grown. This system enables these few buyers to surround the many sellers and hem them in completely, thus using them as a property peculiarly their own, to have, to hold, and to keep.

At any rate, under this new system proposed, the best brains of each community would be given a chance to act upon its own problems and solve them in the most direct and effective way, but also in concert with an organization which has an underlying principle of procedure, or design, back of it all.

The whole thing would work out somewhat after this style: Supposing John Smith, of Whittier, has a dozen sacks of potatoes which he can not sell in his local Whittier market. He can call up or write his Whittier township commission and tell them that he needs a market for that dozen sacks of potatoes. But the township commission does not have a market for them in that township. It in turn calls up the Los Angeles county commission, and says: "County commission, we have a dozen sacks of potatoes for sale. Can you find us a market?" "Yes; there is demand for 12 sacks of potatoes at Sawtelle (in Sawtelle township). Will you send them there?" "Yes; we will send 12 sacks of potatoes to Sawtelle to-day," and John Smith accordingly finds his market, prepares them in proper style for shipping, and sends them to Sawtelle.

"Well, you object, that can be done now without all that machinery to go through." Yes, it can, but here is where the "design" back of all this thing—this machine—comes in. After the county commission has told Whittier commission that there is a market at Sawtelle for his potatoes, supposing El Monte (township) commission comes in with a request for a market for 10 sacks of potatoes. Under the old plan of marketing both producers might have sent their potatoes to the Sawtelle market, and there would be conflict, with the result that potatoes would be a drug on the Sawtelle market, and neither of them would be able to get their price. They would have to be held for future consumption, or else reshipped to some other market, where they might come in conflict with some other shipment from another source of supply. With this machinery in operation, the county commission would say to the El Monte commission, "We have just made arrangements to fill the needs of Sawtelle to-day, but we have an inquiry from Venice (township) for 10 sacks of potatoes; ship them there to John Jones." Thus by both shippers working through their county commission it could direct them aright, while if the two township commissions should try to operate between themselves, and not through its county commission, confusion would arise, because no central bureau would have the information that the two had come to terms on the transaction.

In a large sense this is the big difficulty that shippers of produce are meeting every day. They have no way of knowing that, at the same time they ship a carload of onions for the St. Louis market, Texas is doing the same thing for the same market. Had both shippers some central bureau that would give trustworthy information on such operations or consignments, no duplication of markets need arise.

Now take an example of interstate shipments. Supposing California finds that she has a carload of apples in the hands of some one of its growers, and no local market can use them. The township commission in which the carload of apples is located would call up, or write, its county commission that it had a carload for shipment, but had no local market. The county commission upon investigation would find no local market, so it would wire the State commission its need of a market for a carload of apples. If the State commission could find no market in any of the counties of the State it would then wire the national commission, "Have carload of apples. Where shall we send them?" The national commission, if it had no call for apples, would start a wire, say, to the Louisiana State Commission.

That State commission would wire the Orleans Parish commission, and that parish commission would wire the New Orleans commission, asking if it had a market for a carload of apples. That New Orleans commission would find that Chris. Reuter in New Orleans could use a carload of apples, and back the wire would start, "Ship carload of apples to Chris. Reuter, this city." Now, mark you well the routing of that wire back—first to the parish commission, next to the State commission, then to the national commission, then to the California State commission, then to the county, and finally to the township commission where the apples were on hand. Then the owner would himself ship that car to Chris. Reuter in New Orleans. The commission's work would have been done, and it would not duplicate that order from some other source of supply.

Now, should the New Orleans commission have wired back direct to this California township commission, the national commission or the two State commissions involved might be spending time and money to find a market, without knowing that the market had already been found. Or meanwhile it might have had another inquiry for a market for a carload of apples from Vermont, and not having had the information go through its hands from the New Orleans market, would have routed the Vermont apples through, only to find a duplication.

It has been this very conflict of information or entire absence of it that has caused many losses and disasters to shippers. In other words, there is no design in the marketing situation as it is now. No light; no intelligence. And it is light and intelligence that is needed in the process of handling the products of the soil. We have light and intelligence in every step taken by the maker and seller of lead pencils, muslins, machinery, steel, iron products, or any of the varied products of our industries. That intelligence we take as a matter of course or of pride, according as we look at it. Certainly we never think of it as being paternalistic, nor socialistic, nor even cooperative, but just good, sound business sense. Why not apply the same sound doctrine to agricultural products?

Another point showing the "information" feature: Suppose California is producing asparagus commercially. California markets demand white varieties of asparagus shipped in bulk, while the eastern markets demand the green varieties shipped or packed in bundles. Through this information bureau this intelligence could be given the grower here in California, and he would not be so foolish as to grow white asparagus for the eastern market, nor would he ship in bulk to an eastern market.

Or supposing it is potatoes that are to be shipped. Orders here are placed by the pound or sack. In eastern markets the orders are placed by the bushel or barrel. By inquiry it could be ascertained before shipment that bushel cartons would be more acceptable to the eastern buyer than sacks, and that red potatoes would find an easier market in the South than white, while the Chicago market wants white potatoes altogether.

The situation would be no different were the product fruits, melons, or perishables. The information could be just as specific for them as it need be for hay or grain. If the outlook for tomatoes was bad, information could go out that canning would be advised for all local California tomatoes. The canned product would have a means of finding its market also.

This system or scheme of operation, as provided in the Lubin suggestion, would result in a form of cooperation compatible with the American spirit. Cooperation in agricultural products is a world movement to-day, and corresponds to similar movements among other producing factors. In other branches of economic activity the development is in the direction of larger producing units. So it is in agriculture, and the failure to meet this change with a new theory of marketing has wrought havoc with our markets. In the face of this modern concentration of forces the farmer can not remain isolated, if he is ultimately to retain any influence upon the fruit of his soil.

The resolution under consideration provides a coherent and coordinating clearing house of information on all questions relating to the products of agriculture, both for the use of the producer and consumer. The numerous organizations, widely scattered and wholly disconnected at present, while serving many useful purposes, are not only inadequate but often conflicting when it comes to handling the problem of economic distribution.

This is the great unsolved problem of this country, and until it is solved there will be waste, unprofitable labor, and high living cost. No

greater service could be rendered all the people than is possible with such a commission determined upon the wise solution of the difficulties of marketing and distributing the necessity of life.

We would be betraying the competence of mother earth should we give up in despair. So long as there is one hungry man and one unused potato in the fields that has not found that hungry man we have not succeeded in organizing the greatest of the world's arts—the art of growing things—into a united, intelligent industry, whence can come that opulent productivity which justifies the industry of the farmer.

Now, the proposal is practical or it is not. If it is not, that ends the matter; but if it is, it can be safely counted upon that every Member of the present Congress will feel it his duty not merely to urge the passage of this resolution, but also to exert his best energy toward putting the work called for in the resolution in proper working order.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the insertion of that part of Mr. Lubin's statement that for lack of time the Clerk has not read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment changes existing law, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved August 18, 1914 (Public, No. 174, 63d Cong.), entitled "An act to tax the privilege of dealing on exchanges, boards of trade, and similar places in contracts of sale of cotton for future delivery, and for other purposes," including all expenses necessary for the purchase of equipment and supplies; for travel; for the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and for all other expenses, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, that may be necessary in executing the provisions of this act, \$75,000.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in connection with this item in the bill certain data relating to the workings of the cotton-futures bill as far as it has gone.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. It will be remembered that in my report accompanying the cotton-futures bill, which latter became a law, I predicted that as a result of this legislation the value of the New York contract would be enhanced from \$1 to \$2.50 per bale, and that this enhancement of the value of the quotation basis, reflecting itself in the spot markets of the South, would mean from \$15,000,000 to \$35,000,000 each year additional to the cotton producers.

Immediately succeeding the beginning of the war in Europe the exchanges closed, and remained closed until the 16th day of November. On that day they reopened. The cotton-futures act does not become effective in whole until the 18th of February of this year, but in anticipation of its becoming operative the exchanges since their opening have been dealing in two kinds of contracts, namely, the old contract, under which they formerly operated, and the new contract, drawn to conform substantially with the provisions of the contract provided for in the cotton-futures act. I feel a pardonable pride in finding that my prophecy as to the effect of this act in enhancing the value of cotton in the hands of the farmer is borne out by the difference in the value of the two contracts, showing a much higher value for the new contract over the old, as will be seen by the following comparison furnished me by the Department of Agriculture:

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.		Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
1914. NOV. 16. (Opening day.)							
Spots: Middling, 7.75.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Spots: Middling, 7.75.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
December.....	7.29	7.58	0.19	December.....	7.28	7.35	0.07
January.....	7.39	7.77	.37	January.....	7.39	7.45	.09
March.....	7.40	7.99		March.....	7.48	7.66	.18
May.....				May.....		7.55	
NOV. 17.				NOV. 17.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	6.00	7.25	.16	December.....	7.06	7.13	.07
January.....	7.09	7.47	.39	January.....	7.15	7.22	.07
March.....	7.08	7.67		March.....	7.28	7.34	.03
May.....				May.....	7.35	7.50	.15



Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.	New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
NOV. 18.				NOV. 18.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Spots: Middling, 7½.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
December.....		6.94		December.....	6.98		
January.....	7.04	7.20	0.16	January.....	7.06	7.15	0.09
March.....	7.06	7.41	.35	March.....	7.20	7.22	.02
May.....	7.22	7.62	.40	May.....		7.46	
NOV. 19.				NOV. 19.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7.25.			
December.....		7.01		December.....	7.08		
January.....	7.13	7.27	.14	January.....	7.16	7.27	.11
March.....	7.15	7.48	.33	March.....	7.29	7.37	.08
May.....	7.32	7.69	.37	May.....		7.58	
NOV. 20.				NOV. 20.			
Spots: Middling, 7.60.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.16			December.....	7.17		
January.....	7.28	7.39	.11	January.....	7.25	7.32	.07
March.....	7.30	7.56	.26	March.....	7.35	7.45	.10
May.....	7.46	7.75	.29	May.....	7.50	7.65	.15
NOV. 21.				NOV. 21.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....		7.26		December.....			
January.....	7.37	7.45	.08	January.....	7.37	7.42	.05
March.....	7.37	7.57	.20	March.....		7.55	
May.....	7.51	7.75	.24	May.....		7.74	
NOV. 23.				NOV. 23.			
Spots: Middling 7.75.				Spots: Middling 7½.			
December.....	7.29			December.....	7.26		
January.....	7.40	7.47	.07	January.....	7.32	7.39	.07
March.....	7.42	7.59	.17	March.....	7.38	7.49	.11
May.....	7.55	7.75		May.....	7.58	7.67	.09
NOV. 24.				NOV. 24.			
Spots: Middling 7.75.				Spots: Middling 7½.			
December.....	7.23			December.....	7.22		
January.....	7.34	7.40	.14	January.....	7.29	7.33	.04
March.....	7.36	7.52	.16	March.....	7.36	7.45	.09
May.....	7.43	7.63	.20	May.....	7.53	7.62	.09
NOV. 25.				NOV. 25.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.31			December.....	7.22		
January.....	7.40	7.49	.09	January.....	7.31	7.37	.06
March.....	7.42	7.59	.17	March.....	7.42	7.51	.09
May.....	7.50	7.70	.20	May.....	7.59	7.67	.08
NOV. 27.				NOV. 27.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.37			December.....	7.28		
January.....	7.41	7.52	.11	January.....	7.33	7.37	.04
March.....	7.47	7.63	.16	March.....	7.46	7.55	.09
May.....	7.60	7.75	.15	May.....	7.64	7.72	.08
NOV. 28.				NOV. 28.			
Spots: Middling, 7.75.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.30			December.....	7.12		
January.....	7.32	7.40	.08	January.....	7.20	7.25	.05
March.....	7.36	7.52	.16	March.....	7.34	7.43	.09
May.....	7.50	7.66	.16	May.....	7.52	7.60	.08
NOV. 30.				NOV. 30.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.24			December.....	7.10		
January.....	7.25	7.37	.12	January.....	7.24	7.24	.00
March.....	7.29	7.51	.22	March.....	7.30	7.39	.09
May.....	7.50	7.64	.14	May.....	7.47	7.56	.09
DEC. 1.				DEC. 1.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.14			December.....	7.08		
January.....	7.16	7.31	.15	January.....	7.25	7.24	.01
March.....	7.20	7.49	.20	March.....	7.28	7.37	.09
May.....	7.45	7.61	.16	May.....	7.45	7.54	.09
DEC. 2.				DEC. 2.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.15			December.....	7.14		
January.....	7.16	7.31	.15	January.....	7.26	7.25	.01
March.....	7.19	7.48	.29	March.....	7.27	7.36	.09
May.....	7.45	7.60	.15	May.....	7.41	7.53	.12
DEC. 3.				DEC. 3.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	6.99			December.....	6.99		
January.....	7.02	7.15	.13	January.....	7.12	7.10	.02
March.....	7.05	7.37	.32	March.....	7.14	7.21	.07
May.....	7.32	7.49	.17	May.....	7.27	7.40	.13

¹ Old style.

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.	New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
DEC. 4.				DEC. 4.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Spots: Middling, 7½¢.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
December.....	6.99			December.....	6.94		
January.....	7.03	7.17	.14	January.....	7.12	7.11	.01
March.....	7.05	7.37	.32	March.....	7.14	7.22	.08
May.....	7.34	7.52	.18	May.....	7.27	7.41	.17
DEC. 5.				DEC. 5.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	7.05			December.....	7.00		
January.....	7.07	7.20	.13	January.....	7.22	7.19	.03
March.....	7.09	7.39	.30	March.....	7.19	7.29	.10
May.....	7.42	7.57	.15	May.....	7.34	7.48	.14
DEC. 7.				DEC. 7.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	7.03			December.....	6.97		
January.....	7.03	7.20	.12	January.....	7.19	7.18	.01
March.....	7.10	7.40	.30	March.....	7.20	7.29	.09
May.....	7.43	7.59	.16	May.....	7.34	7.48	.14
DEC. 8.				DEC. 8.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	7.06			December.....	7.06		
January.....	7.08	7.22	.14	January.....	7.18	7.16	.02
March.....	7.10	7.41	.31	March.....	7.23	7.26	.03
May.....	7.43	7.59	.16	May.....	7.37	7.46	.11
DEC. 9.				DEC. 9.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	7.04			December.....	6.93		
January.....	7.06	7.14	.08	January.....	7.06	7.04	.02
March.....	7.08	7.33	.25	March.....	7.14	7.18	.04
May.....	7.37	7.51	.14	May.....	7.26	7.37	.11
DEC. 10.				DEC. 10.			
Spots: Middling, 7.40.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	6.88			December.....	6.80		
January.....	7.90	7.02	.12	January.....	6.92	6.92	
March.....	6.92	7.17	.25	March.....	6.99	7.03	.04
May.....	7.21	7.35	.14	May.....	7.10	7.21	.11
DEC. 11.				DEC. 11.			
Spots: Middling, 7.25.				Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December.....	6.67			December.....	6.74		
January.....	6.69	6.88	.19	January.....	6.85	6.86	.01
March.....	6.89	7.09	.20	March.....	6.95	6.95	
May.....	7.13	7.27		May.....		7.13	
DEC. 12.				DEC. 12.			
Spots: Middling, 7.30.				Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December.....	6.80			December.....	6.85		
January.....	6.80	6.98	.18	January.....	6.95	6.95	
March.....	6.96	7.19	.23	March.....	7.03	7.03	
May.....	7.21	7.36	.15	May.....		7.21	
DEC. 14.				DEC. 14.			
Spots: Middling, 7.35.				Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December.....	6.93			December.....	6.72		
January.....	6.94	7.10	.06	January.....	7.04	7.02	.02
March.....	7.10	7.31	.21	March.....	7.15	7.15	.00
May.....	7.34	7.49	.15	May.....	7.23	7.33	.10
DEC. 15.				DEC. 15.			
Spots: Middling, 7.35.				Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December.....	6.88			December.....	6.90		
January.....	6.85	7.07	.22	January.....	7.00	6.98	.02
March.....	7.06	7.27	.21	March.....	7.10	7.10	.00
May.....	7.30	7.45	.15	May.....	7.18	7.28	.10
DEC. 16.				DEC. 16.			
Spots: Middling, 7.35.				Spots: Middling, 7 cents.			
December.....	6.97			December.....	6.97		
January.....	6.95	7.16	.21	January.....	7.07	7.07	
March.....	7.14	7.35	.21	March.....	7.20	7.18	.02
May.....	7.38	7.52	.14	May.....	7.26	7.36	.10
DEC. 17.				DEC. 17.			
Spots: Middling, 7.40.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	7.05			December.....	7.04		
January.....	7.05	7.26	.21	January.....	7.14	7.13	.01
March.....	7.24	7.46	.22	March.....	7.28	7.26	.02
May.....	7.50	7.66	.16	May.....	7.36	7.46	.10
DEC. 18.				DEC. 18.			
Spots: Middling, 7.40.				Spots: Middling, 7½¢.			
December.....	7.11			December.....	7.00		
January.....	7.10	7.31	.21	January.....	7.14	7.12	.02
March.....	7.28	7.50	.22	March.....	7.29	7.28	.01
May.....	7.51	7.66	.15	May.....	7.37	7.47	.10

1 Old style.



Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.	New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
DEC. 19.				DEC. 19.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Spots: Middling, 7½.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
December.....	7.14			December.....	7.03	7.14	0.11
January.....	7.14	7.34	0.20	January.....	7.15	7.15	
March.....	7.35	7.52	.17	March.....	7.32	7.31	1.01
May.....	7.54	7.69	.15	May.....	7.41	7.51	.10
DEC. 21.				DEC. 21.			
Spots: Middling, 7.50.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.15			December.....	7.00		
January.....	7.16	7.38	.22	January.....	7.17	7.15	1.02
March.....	7.35	7.57	.22	March.....	7.34	7.33	1.01
May.....	7.57	7.74	.17	May.....	7.42	7.52	.10
DEC. 22.				DEC. 22.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.33			December.....		7.35	
January.....	7.33	7.55	.22	January.....	7.28	7.28	
March.....	7.55	7.73	.18	March.....	7.52	7.51	1.01
May.....	7.77	7.93	.16	May.....	7.59	7.69	.10
DEC. 23.				DEC. 23.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.23			December.....	6.95		
January.....	7.22	7.44	.22	January.....	7.14	7.13	1.01
March.....	7.44	7.62	.18	March.....	7.39	7.38	1.01
May.....	7.65	7.80	.15	May.....	7.48	7.58	.10
DEC. 24.				DEC. 24.			
Spots: Middling, 7.65.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.32			December.....	7.17		
January.....	7.23	7.51	.28	January.....	7.17	7.24	.07
March.....	7.51	7.69	.18	March.....	7.49	7.48	1.01
May.....	7.72	7.87	.15	May.....	7.57	7.67	.10
DEC. 25 (holiday).				DEC. 25 (holiday).			
DEC. 26 (holiday).				DEC. 26 (holiday).			
DEC. 28.				DEC. 28.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.42			December.....	7.05		
January.....	7.40	7.64	.24	January.....	7.17	7.27	.10
March.....	7.63	7.82	.18	March.....	7.57	7.58	.01
May.....	7.85	8.01	.16	May.....	7.68	7.78	.10
DEC. 29.				DEC. 29.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.38			December.....	7.05		
January.....	7.38	7.62	.24	January.....	7.27	7.27	.00
March.....	7.61	7.81	.20	March.....	7.56	7.57	.01
May.....	7.85	8.01	.16	May.....	7.67	7.77	.01
DEC. 30.				DEC. 30.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....	7.33			December.....	6.90		
January.....	7.31	7.65	.34	January.....	7.26	7.26	
March.....	7.55	7.79	.24	March.....	7.52	7.53	.01
May.....	7.80	7.95	.15	May.....	7.64	7.74	.10
DEC. 31.				DEC. 31.			
Spots: Middling, 7.80.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
December.....				December.....			
January.....	7.25	7.67	.42	January.....	7.26	7.28	.02
March.....	7.55	7.80	.25	March.....	7.54	7.55	.01
May.....	7.80	7.98	.18	May.....	7.67	7.75	.08
1915.				1915.			
JAN. 1 (HOLIDAY).				JAN. 1 (HOLIDAY).			
JAN. 2.				JAN. 2.			
Spots: Middling, 7.90.				Spots: Middling (holiday).			
January.....	7.40	7.80	.40	January.....			
March.....	7.70	7.93	.23	March.....			
May.....	7.95	8.12	.07	May.....			
JAN. 4.				JAN. 4.			
Spots: Middling, 8.05.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
January.....	7.55	7.95	.40	January.....	7.58	7.58	
March.....	7.87	8.12	.25	March.....	7.81	7.83	.02
May.....	8.12	8.31	.19	May.....	7.94	8.02	.08
JAN. 5.				JAN. 5.			
Spots: Middling, 8.05.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
January.....	7.46	8.02	.56	January.....	7.63	7.63	
March.....	7.85	8.20	.35	March.....	7.83	7.88	.05
May.....	8.10	8.36	.26	May.....	7.96	8.07	.11

1 Old style.

Comparison of the old and the new style contracts on the New York and New Orleans Cotton Exchanges at closing prices—Continued.

New York.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.	New Orleans.	Closing prices.		Premium for new contracts.
	Old style.	New style.			Old style.	New style.	
JAN. 6.				JAN. 6.			
Spots: Middling, 8.05.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Spots: Middling, 7½.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
January.....	7.43	7.87	0.44	January.....	7.52	7.46	10.06
March.....	7.55	8.05	.50	March.....	7.69	7.74	.05
May.....	7.80	8.25	.45	May.....	7.84	7.95	.11
JAN. 7.				JAN. 7.			
Spots: Middling, 8 cents.				Spots: Middling, 7½.			
January.....	7.40	7.77	.37	January.....	7.48	7.41	1.07
March.....	7.52	7.97	.45	March.....	7.68	7.68	.00
May.....	7.77	8.17	.40	May.....	7.81	7.89	.08

1 Old style.

I desire also to quote from the market letter of January 8, 1915, of A. Norden & Co., of New York, a large cotton firm, bearing upon the effect of the Lever Act upon the market:

Some of the selling has also been from southern sources, as the advance here was much more rapid than in southern markets, and at times we have apparently been on a parity that might warrant shipments from some localities on a commercial basis; it must not be overlooked, however, that with our new contract this shipping parity has changed radically; New York will no longer be the dumping ground for undesirable odds and ends, and cotton will only come here in volume, if our prices are maintained on a competitive level with the rest of the world.

The largest cotton manufacturer in the South, and probably the best-informed man in the South upon cotton in all of its phases, writes me under date of January 8, 1915, as follows:

It will interest you to know that during this season the New York contracts are maintaining, as they should, a proper relation to southern spots.

This was one of the main purposes of the bill and was predicted as the result of the cotton-futures act. I said also in my report accompanying the cotton-futures bill that the adoption of the bill would tend to make manipulation less frequent and at the same time fluctuation less violent and therefore legitimate hedging more safe. That prediction is being borne out, as is shown from this excerpt from the market letter of Shearson, Hammill & Co., of January 6, 1915:

The New York Cotton Exchange has adopted the Government standards of grade, and is now operating under the provisions of the United States cotton-futures act, commonly known as the Lever bill. Under the new classification, the buyer is assured of receiving a merchantable grade of recognized spinning value, and the future market should reflect this improved standard at all times. It is possible, therefore, for the investor to use the New York market on a basis of future delivery without involving a tie-up of any material sum of money, and obtaining the same results involved in the purchase, storage, and insurance of the actual cotton itself.

I desire to submit also an excerpt from the market letter of Henry Clews & Co., of New York, of January 5, 1915, one of the largest brokerage firms in the country and one of the most reliable, as follows:

There was a quiet tone to the cotton market during the entire week, but the undertone continued strong, due in great part to the further increase in buying for foreign account and domestic investment interests. To some degree, however, the firmness was owing to the fact that the new contract under the terms of the United States futures act is really stronger than the trade has been generally led to believe. On the medium grades, which include middling, strict middling, and good middling, as well as strict low middling, it has been discovered that the new Government standards are worth 35 or more points over the old standard of classification. In addition to this it is necessary to consider the stipulation of the staple, which calls for at least seven-eighths of an inch. While this requirement does not affect deliveries from such sections as Texas, Oklahoma, or Arkansas, it has a decided influence on tenders from the eastern portion of the belt. Another feature that should be considered in regard to the new contract is the single certificate provision, which makes it possible for the holder of contracts of cotton in the local stock to withdraw a certain number of bales and replace these withdrawals without being forced to take out certificates for the full contract. There is no question that these three features alone demonstrate the enhanced value of the new contract, and, as repeatedly pointed out in these advices, the New York market is now as never before the best spinners' market of the world.

It is very gratifying to me, because I have spent 10 years in the study of this problem, to feel that this act is working in the interest of the cotton producer and is at this moment adding from \$25,000,000 to \$35,000,000 to the value of his crop for this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Office of Markets and Rural Organization, \$484,050.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to detain the House at all, but so many gentlemen have made speeches on the subject of marketing, telling how the farmer receives such a low price for his products as compared with what he ought to receive, especially my friend from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON], who has just stated that the farmer in his State received 20 cents a bushel less for wheat than the market prices would justify, that I am lead to say a word or two.

Last summer the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE] offered a resolution directing the Bureau of Corporations in the Department of Commerce to make an investigation of the selling price of wheat in Kansas, asserting in his preamble, as I recall it, that wheat there was selling by the farmer for 20 to 25 cents a bushel less than the market price would justify. Finally the resolution was passed, delegating the Secretary of Agriculture to make the investigation, and that investigation was made by this bureau; and in a report sent to Congress on December 7 last is the result of that investigation.

When we came to examine the report of the department we found that instead of the farmers of Kansas selling their wheat—I presume the same thing applies to North Dakota—for from 20 to 25 cents a bushel less than the market price would justify, this statement, part of the summary, is set forth:

The prices of wheat paid to farmers in Kansas are based largely upon the prices in Kansas City, Mo., and at the Gulf ports for export. From these basic prices must be subtracted the freight rate, shipper's profit, and other incidental charges and the margin taken out by the country elevator to determine the price which is paid to the farmer. Since the margins of profit taken by the grain dealers in the larger markets are very small—averaging about 1 cent a bushel—it appears that the farmers of Kansas, as a general rule, are obtaining all their wheat is worth.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In corroboration of what the gentleman has stated, I wish to say that a statement was recently made to me by a gentleman connected with one of the great grain exchanges of the country that he was selling grain at a profit of one-eighth of a cent per bushel. His profit was included in that.

Mr. MANN. Here I read another extract from the report, page 5, which is as exhaustive on the subject, and it gives an illustration. I read:

Country buyers work on a margin of from 2½ to 4 cents per bushel. Hence, the country price on a given day would be the price for which the buyer can sell his grain "on track" at the elevator, less his margin. For example, on September 28, an elevator which allows a margin of 3 cents per bushel on all wheat purchased received several track bids averaging 90½ cents per bushel, basis No. 2 hard, which is the contract grade in Kansas. The quotation to farmers on this day was the "on-track" price quoted the elevator less its margin of 3 cents, or in this case making the price to the farmer 86½ cents per bushel. When the local buyer does his shipping on a commission basis he will take the spot price at Kansas City, subtract the freight and other charges incident to selling in Kansas City, and deduct his margin. If the market quotation at Kansas City on spots is 97 cents, the freight to Kansas City 5 cents, commission and other charges 1½ cents, and the elevator margin 3 cents, the local market price would be 97 cents minus 9½ cents, or 87½ cents.

That is the way the wheat is sold; and if there are farmers in Kansas or North Dakota, who do not know enough to sell their wheat for the market price at Duluth or Minneapolis, less the freight charges, a very small commission charge, and a very small elevator charge, what they need is an education. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] ought to print a speech and send it to all of them, so that they will know their rights.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. NORTON. From the reading of the pamphlet by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I am led to believe that the gentleman who wrote it probably knows considerably more about city-farm life than he does about some of the problems surrounding the marketing of grain.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to inform him who wrote it?

Mr. NORTON. It may be that the Secretary of Agriculture did, who is reported in the newspapers to have stated a short time ago—

Mr. MANN. No; it was not written by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. NORTON. That the farmers of the country did not need any rural-credit legislation.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to state who wrote it.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois state who wrote it?

Mr. NORTON. I shall be pleased to have the gentleman state the names of the authors of the article.

Mr. MANN. It was written by W. H. Kerr and L. H. D. Weld, Office of Markets and Rural Organization, and Charles J. Brand, chief of this bureau.

Mr. NORTON. I will state to the gentleman that the condition in North Dakota during the months in which practically all of the marketing of grain was done last fall was this: The cash price of wheat in Minneapolis and Duluth was from 10 to 20 cents a bushel higher than was the future market price of grain; that is, the cash market price of wheat in September at the terminal grain markets was from 10 to 20 cents a bushel higher than the November and December future market price. The local elevators in North Dakota bought the farmers' wheat at local prices, based on the future market price of wheat less transportation and incidental charges, and not at all based on the cash market price of wheat at the terminals.

Mr. MANN. That would depend on when it was delivered.

Mr. NORTON. It was delivered to the local elevators, of course, at the time it was bought.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not usually.

Mr. NORTON. Such has been always my observation.

Mr. MADDEN. Not future prices.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is not familiar with the handling of this product, I am afraid.

Mr. NORTON. With all due respect to the general superior knowledge of the gentleman, I am confident that I know as much about the problems pertaining to the marketing of wheat as does the gentleman from Illinois. I am convinced of the fact, also from my own observations and experience, that the farmers of my State received in most cases last fall from 10 to 20 cents a bushel less for their wheat than they would have received for it if they had been able to market it through a cooperative marketing exchange.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak again on this question, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has so completely missed the point which Members have urged here as to what the farmers received for their crops, and has so clearly failed to comprehend the point that I urged in this matter of markets, that I feel impelled to make a few more observations.

Mr. MANN. I did not hear the gentleman's speech, so I disclaim any effort to answer it.

Mr. MANAHAN. I regret that the gentleman did not hear my speech.

Mr. MANN. I regret it, too.

Mr. MANAHAN. It would have enlightened the gentleman on this important subject of marketing.

Mr. MANN. I have heard it before, and I never thought so.

Mr. MANAHAN. Read it again. I never lose faith in the capacity of the gentleman from Illinois to understand, if he will study long enough.

Now, the point made by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and others regarding what the farmers receive for their products—its inadequacy under present marketing conditions—is based upon facts; and when the gentleman from Illinois says that the report which he read shows that the farmers received approximately what they ought to receive, deducting from the price upon the market place transportation, commissions, and incidental terminal expenses, and rests his case upon that, he does not take into consideration at all the more important fact that the price upon the market place is an artificial price, made by gamblers betting on the future price. The

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] ought to know that every bushel of cash wheat or grain sold upon the Chicago market is based upon the future bidding in the pit at the very hour when it is sold. In other words, the men in the pit and speculators from all over the country operating in the pit; clerks in banks and in business houses, for instance, who want to take a "flyer" upon the market place, are competing in the market place with the farmer who really has grain to sell, and beating down his price for real grain by what they think they may be able to buy grain for several months in the future.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the grain-producing States the farmers also indulge in fliers, as the gentleman calls them?

Mr. MANAHAN. A few poor, misguided farmers may, but that does not justify the infamy of having the price of a staple article of food made by gamblers in the pit. [Applause.] And when any man says to me that that is an honest price, I say he does not know what he is talking about. It is a gambler's price; a dishonest gambler's price; a dishonest gambler's deliberately dishonest price.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MANAHAN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman name one agricultural product that is not dealt in upon the exchanges that costs as little from the producer to the consumer as those that are dealt in on exchanges—just one?

Mr. MANAHAN. I certainly can.

Mr. SHERLEY. Name it.

Mr. MANAHAN. Barley; and I myself put the proposition up to the leading officials of the Chicago Board of Trade before the Rules Committee of this House, and I put the same proposition up before the leading members of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, before the legislative investigating committee of the Minnesota Legislature, for which I was the attorney two years ago, to produce their books, and offered to show by their own records that every grain that was not affected by future trading sold at a closer margin than grain affected by pit trading, notwithstanding the fact that many of the local inspectors in grading malt barley graded it as feed barley—notwithstanding this dishonesty barley sold by the producer closer to the real price than wheat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANAHAN. I have not taken much time of the House.

Mr. LEVER. I know the gentleman has not taken much time, but if every Member of the House should take the time the gentleman has, even 10 minutes, we would not be able to get through. But I will not object.

Mr. MANN. Let us see whether the debate is ended then or not.

Mr. LEVER. I had the idea that this was the last speech. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. HELGESEN. I object. I want five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I just read an extract from an official report, and it will take the gentleman four days to answer it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, in answer to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], it was put squarely up to the great operators in Chicago and Minneapolis to show by their books the actual amount they made on grain subject to sale for future delivery and how much they made on grain not subject to pit trading. They did not dare produce their books, because, by the system they have, instead of making 1 cent on a bushel, which is the ostensible commission, they make 6 cents, 7 cents, or 8 cents a bushel. How? By a concerted action and arrangement between themselves and local inspectors and public-warehouse men, by which bidding in futures is manipulated for the purpose of making the market fluctuate, and prices are forced up or down at will by means of grain in the warehouses they control, where the enormous quantities are stored, and which they can throw in a doctored, mixed, and depreciated condition into the market for the purpose of controlling their trading program.

Only December last a case was tried in Chicago, with which I have no doubt the gentleman from Illinois is familiar, in which

Mr. Leiter was sued for \$330,000 by Peavy and Pillsbury, so-called elevator interests of Minneapolis. It was in the time of the Leiter corner in wheat that the cause of action arose. These men, Peavy and Pillsbury, it was claimed, broke an agreement with Leiter to withhold their grain while he cornered the market, and it cost Leiter and his father something like twelve or thirteen million dollars. The corner in wheat was busted, and Leiter was almost busted because, forsooth, the agreement with his fellow gamblers busted under temptation.

Leiter was sued for \$330,000 worth of notes that he gave to elevators controlled by these coconspirators of his, while they were in bad faith unloading their storage grain upon him, and Judge Humphrey, of the Federal court, submitted to the jury the question of whether or not there was an illegal conspiracy between these three men to control the price of wheat, and if they found that there was such a conspiracy to control the price of wheat the notes would be void. It was submitted on the testimony showing the understanding between these men—only three men—and the jury brought in a verdict that there was such a conspiracy, and the \$330,000 in notes were declared void. If three men can by this sort of agreement as to how they shall bid in the pit and withholding their grain in storage control the price of wheat, as they showed they could, what can half a dozen do? What can the whole combination do, operating as a close corporation like the chamber of commerce?

Mr. SHERLEY. What happened to that attempted deal? The fellows that were in it went broke.

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes; but the price of wheat went up almost to the present price.

Mr. SHERLEY. Did it hurt the farmer?

Mr. MANAHAN. Of course it did. The farmers did not unload any of that wheat. The speculators had gotten nearly all of the wheat in the elevators before they conspired to corner the market and hold up consumers. The Peavys and the Pillsburys had the wheat, and the farmers did not have it. The suggestion that future trading lessens the margin of profit between the price the producer gets and the price the consumer pays is absurd. Is any man so childish as to think that these great operators whose profits depend upon this margin would cling so tenaciously to the pit and defend it so valiantly if it narrowed their margin and cut their profits? Are the Armours and Leiters and Pillsburys in the grain business for their health or for profit—big, fat profit?

They want wide margin between producer and consumer. They do not operate their corners in the fall, but wait until after the farmers are compelled to sell the wheat. After the bulk of the crop has been sent to market the pit machinery is set in motion to boost the price of wheat and flour, and the consumers pay the excessive prices. The farmers are compelled to sell their wheat early, as a rule, and the result is that the wheat they sell cheap the middle men later sell at a very much higher price to the consumer in the form of flour. I say again and deliberately that these gamblers' prices are swindling prices. They do not depend upon the law of supply and demand, which is practically constant and unchanging.

Why, look at it. Right after war was declared they boosted it up 40 cents. Then it went down 20 cents. It has ever since been juggled back and forth. Every time the price of grain changes 1 cent it affects the value of the farmers' product in the United States \$50,000,000. If it juggled 10 cents, it is affected \$500,000,000 in the aggregate.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the export of wheat have something to do with it?

Mr. MANAHAN. Very little. The members of the Chicago Board of Trade, the grain gamblers, deal in three hundred times as much phantom wheat as they actually handle in real wheat. They sell more wheat futures every day than actually comes to Chicago in a year. That was shown by the testimony before the Rules Committee. They make the price of wheat for the world, because their pit trading dominates, and what they send abroad or export to Liverpool is miserable doctored wheat, which can not affect domestic prices. Only yesterday the head of the chemical department, under the pure-food act, attached 100 cars of grain in Baltimore and other export points for being doctored and adulterated with water and screenings by Chicago Board of Trade and other operators in the West. If our prices were not made by gamblers operating under cover of monopoly, and if foreign buyers were not swindled repeatedly by dishonest dealers, shielded by boards of trade, where the pot dare not call the kettle black, the law of world supply and demand would doubtless maintain a fair and almost constant price for all staple articles of food. [Applause.]

[Mr. HELGESEN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Department of Agriculture, for routine and ordinary work, \$19,702,712.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the question of markets.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to these requests? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the plant-quarantine act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of August 20, 1912, as amended March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests; to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the sale or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and also—

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 74, line 2, by adding at the end of the line, after "\$50,000," the following:

"Provided, That no part of the sum in this paragraph or this act appropriated shall be used or expended in the enforcing of any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture which have for their purpose an intention to, and do in effect, give preference to the ports of one State over those of another."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

[Mr. BARTLETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we ought to have some understanding as to the time to be allowed for this debate.

Mr. ADAMSON. This is an important matter, Mr. Chairman, and my colleague has not interfered much with this discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that; but we ought to have some understanding about the close of debate.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. Sisson. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have not opened my mouth to-day, and there are many gentlemen who have talked repeatedly on the bill, among them my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who wants to limit debate.

Mr. BARTLETT. No; he does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I do not wish to cut off the gentleman. We do not want to lose our suppers and our sleep as well.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate close on this paragraph and amendments thereto in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the chairman of the committee that he must recognize the importance of the matter that the gentleman from Georgia is talking about.

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want my colleague from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] to have ample opportunity to discuss it; and if he is allowed that opportunity, I promise that I shall not speak on it myself.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend from Georgia that in his State the sea-island cotton that is produced there, and that which is produced in South Carolina and Florida, serves the purpose of the long-staple cotton, and we do not want this long-staple stuff coming there from abroad if it will be in the least dangerous.

Mr. Sisson. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 10 minutes on this amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON. I hope my colleague from Georgia will not be lost in the shuffle.



Mr. LEVER. It is now nearly 6 o'clock.

Mr. SISSON. I understand that it is nearly 6 o'clock; but I am so much interested in the amendment that the gentleman from Georgia offers that I feel the House is entitled to know the full limitation of that amendment. I have no desire on earth to delay the proceedings. So far as I am concerned, I have no desire on earth to delay the bill. I have been here helping to make a quorum, and I have not discussed the bill, and I have taken up no time, but this is a matter in which I am very much interested.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Chairman, in view of that statement, I will modify my request and ask unanimous consent that the debate close in 15 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. With the understanding that I may get unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does that take care of the extension of the time of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT]?

Mr. LEVER. That will be included.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from South Carolina state his request again?

Mr. ADAMSON. That all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. That does not include argument on the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Reserving the right to object, I want to proceed myself for 10 minutes, and if he will include in his request that I may have 10 minutes, I have no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. That will take care of itself.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will withhold his request, Mr. Chairman, I will make a personal request that I may be permitted to address the committee for 10 minutes on this amendment, at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. STAFFORD. There is one question pending before the House, and I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina withhold his request?

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ADAMSON. The request I made was, first, that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] be allowed to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER] first, in the hope that some definite time could be agreed upon.

Mr. SISSON. I shall have to object, unless I can get consent to address the committee for 10 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. That time can be yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will not object, he can get his time.

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection, if I can get the time.

Mr. HEFLIN. Following the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not permitted under the rule to yield to any gentleman more than five minutes without unanimous consent.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection to the gentleman having 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. With the understanding that I may have 10 minutes—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Regular order.

Mr. SISSON. If I can not get my request—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Chair is absolutely powerless to give him that assurance.

Mr. SISSON. I am trying to get the committee to give me that courtesy.

Mr. LEVER. Recognition is the right of the Chair.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman modify his request so as to give the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] 5 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi 10 minutes?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, the regular order has been called for.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order has been called for. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order having been called for, the gentleman must either object or not object.

Mr. SISSON. Then I object.

Mr. ADAMSON. Then I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BARTLETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word. The gentleman from Georgia referred to me a moment ago—

Mr. BARTLETT. I should not if the gentleman had not "buted in."

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to "butt in" whenever I hear a speech made directly antagonistic to the best interest of the cotton producers of the South. I did not mean to be discourteous to my good friend from Georgia in "butting in" as he calls it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that he is any more interested in the cotton raisers of the South than I am? My State raises one-third more cotton than does his.

Mr. HEFLIN. That may be true, but I think if the cotton producers of the gentleman's district were permitted to determine just now who is their best friend, the gentleman or myself, I am inclined to the opinion that they would decide in my favor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this Government exercising the authority that it has to prevent the shipment of fruit trees affected with deadly parasites into the various sections of this country. I think the Government has a right to prevent cattle and other animals that have the foot-and-mouth disease from coming into the various sections of our country, and I think that this Government has the right, and it ought to exercise that right, to prevent the coming into the South of cotton from Egypt affected with the pink boll worm, and in the name of twenty-seven millions of people interested directly in the cotton industry I protest against the bringing of the Egyptian pink worm into the South. We have had enough trouble with the boll weevil without having the Egyptian pink boll worm turned loose upon us.

Mr. Chairman, we are producing in the gentleman's own State of Georgia some of the finest sea-island cotton in the world, and we grow some of it in South Carolina and some in the State of Florida, and now to permit the Egyptian cotton, with its pink boll worm, to come in in competition with our long-staple cotton seems ridiculous to me. No, Mr. Chairman; it is not to the interest of the cotton producers to bring these pink boll worms into the South in order that two or three mills may have the opportunity to spin a little Egyptian cotton. We can produce the finest short-staple cotton in the world, and now we are growing some of the finest long-staple cotton to be found anywhere. I plead for the exercise of the quarantine power of the Government against this infected Egyptian cotton going into the South. Hold it for 24 months? Yes; 48 months, if necessary; long enough to destroy the boll worm and the eggs; and that is the purpose of the provision that the gentleman talks against.

I can not see to save my life why the gentleman pleads for the nonenforcement of a provision like this. The course that he would have us take in this matter is not in the interest of the masses of the people in the cotton-producing States. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, practically all I have is invested in raising cotton. I produce principally what is called good bender or staple cotton, but this amendment I favor, first, because it limits the expenditure of this appropriation by the department in accordance with the Constitution. Now, if this board sees fit to establish a quarantine and close all the ports of the United States to cotton, and they feel that that is proper, then they should assume the responsibility, but I do not believe that this Congress ought to say, by voting this amendment down, that that provision of the Constitution which provides that no preference shall be given to one port of one State over that of another port is constitutional. My own private interest, and that of my section, could be advanced by shutting out all foreign cotton, but we can not afford to violate our oath of office, even to do that.

When I voted against the proposition to vest the Secretary of Agriculture or this board with this enormous power I anticipated in the exercise of that power something like this might

happen. If this precedent is to be set, then you vest with this board the power of quarantining to that extent that they can discriminate and force all the cotton imported into the United States to come to one particular port.

If I understand the order properly now, it provides that the importation of cotton into the United States will come into the port at New York or Boston or San Francisco, thereby excluding the importation of cotton into any other port of the United States. Not only that, but it provides that after the cotton shall have been imported into the United States, whatever may be the effect upon any mill in the South, this cotton shall be kept two years. So under the guise of these quarantine rules you are preventing the southern cotton mills from securing any of this cotton they may desire to secure.

Another thing is it increases the amount of freight that must be paid from the port of Boston or New York to the southern mill. I would not place that extra burden upon any mill in any section of the United States. I do not believe that under the Constitution they have the right to expend the money in this way, and this limitation is one which says that you can not expend this money in violation of the Constitution of the United States. If they want to protect the cotton, it is their duty to prevent this importation of cotton altogether, but by an order of the executive department, something this Congress can not do, you are vesting that board with a power that Congress itself has not the power to enforce.

But I am unwilling to give that much power to any single department of this Government. I do care how it may affect the southern cotton interests so far as this bill is concerned. I will support the Constitution of the United States. But the Secretary of Agriculture should, by the proper means, ascertain whether or not the cotton so imported has been exposed to this weevil or worm, and then should shut out altogether, as he ought to do under his oath of office, the cotton which has been exposed to this worm. But cotton which has not been exposed to this worm and tends in no way to bring the weevil into this country should be shipped into all the ports of all the States just alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I presume the gentleman will be able to conclude in those five minutes.

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a second?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to suggest one thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in six minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want a couple of minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in—

Mr. LEVER. Ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now the question is on the request of the gentleman from Mississippi that he be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have two or three minutes on this.

Mr. LEVER. The time is in the control of the Chair, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. I understood that the gentleman intended to grant two minutes to the gentleman behind him.

Mr. LEVER. He said he is not certain he may need it. I will give the gentleman one minute.

Mr. MOORE. This, I understand, is the selection of certain ports through which the exports of this country shall go?

Mr. Sisson. The amendment was to prevent it.

Mr. MOORE. The amendment indicated that no money shall be spent for the purpose of particularizing with regard to ports. Mr. HEFLIN. I will say the amendment, as I understand it, is against the cotton coming from an infected region.

Mr. BARTLETT. It does not say anything of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from South Carolina has not been objected to. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask unanimous consent that the agreement may be modified as to time and make it 12 minutes, so that Mr. Moore may have 2.

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina modifies his request and asks that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. Sisson. For a short question.

Mr. ADAMSON. If cotton or any other property or individuals are required to perform quarantine, must not that be done first?

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely.

Mr. ADAMSON. Let that be done first and then give equal right of access to all ports.

Mr. Sisson. That is my position exactly. Now, gentlemen, if you will note the order of the Agricultural Department, it excludes the importation into this country of all cotton, whether infected or not, named and specified in the order, and that is all the cotton that is raised in the world except Indian cotton, and it prevents it from coming into ports except those three ports—Boston, New York, and San Francisco. Now, my position is that in the exercise of quarantine power of the United States you must first ascertain that there is something wrong with the subject matter quarantined. If a man can by a proper regulation act certify under proper authority that the cotton he endeavors to ship into any port of the United States has not been infected by the boll weevil or the pink boll weevil, then I say in the name of justice, in the name of the Constitution, he has the right to import that cotton into the United States. And I am unwilling that a body of men who are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, vested under the statute with certain powers in reference to quarantine—that they may set aside a specific provision of the Constitution under the guise of quarantine regulations. Now, if the cotton is infected, no man wants that cotton imported into this country, and if they will make an order in accordance with such authority unquestionably all the cotton growers of the South will be absolutely protected. Now, I have declined to vote for a duty on cotton. I raise cotton which is a long-staple cotton, which could be protected 5, 6, 8, 9, or 10 cents a pound. Whatever amount of protection is placed upon it would inure to my private benefit, because we raise a million bales less long-staple cotton than actually comes into the United States, but you are putting a quarantine upon cotton and making an absolute prohibition on the cotton, except you ship into these two favored ports on the eastern seaboard and one on the west.

Now, gentlemen, I do not believe that I am looking in the face of men who are willing to say that this amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], which provides that none of this money shall be expended for the purpose of evading the provision of the Constitution which says that no port in any one State shall receive preference over another port, and if the quarantine authorities want to see a quarantine so as to protect the southern cotton grower, let them require a proper and safe provision that the cotton shipped into any of these ports is not infected by the boll weevil, and it will come.

And then, when that is done, I want to see the ports of Delaware and the ports of Pennsylvania, and the ports of all New England, and the other ports where it would not affect them—I want to see all those ports receive absolutely the same treatment. The cotton that would be infected, if you please, could be admitted, if they saw fit and proper, into those ports where the boll weevil could not spread to that cotton which is not affected. I take it that no man will hold that the infected cotton should be subject to quarantine regulations if that cotton is not shipped into all the ports of the United States alike. Then you would not be violating the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

I do not know anything personally about the effect of the pink boll weevil, but I do know that they are raising a great deal of cotton in Egypt. I do know that Egypt is prospering in the cotton-raising business, notwithstanding the weevil. I do know that the islands of the sea, where they say they have it, are producing about a million bales, which is being imported into the United States every year. If that be true, it is not doing much harm. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. The Chair will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. Some of you remember the difficulty we had in securing passage of the Simmons law, which came from the



Committee on Agriculture, the law under which this quarantine board was established. When the bill was before the House you were given facts and conditions which showed the necessity of enacting it into law. You were told that nearly every one of the pests and diseases which prevail in this country was brought in from a foreign country, and that its coming might have been prevented if we had had such a law as this Simmons law and a quarantine board such as has been organized under that law, so that foreign pests and diseases could have been shut out. Their coming has caused a loss of millions of money and the destruction of untold millions of property. This quarantine board inspects products coming or offered for import from foreign countries, and forbids altogether the entry of those which are very dangerous. The board is composed of well-informed and intelligent men, and is doing its duty. Do not tie the hands of these men in this important matter.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I can not yield in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Do not yield to a demand based on nothing except local pride or a desire to secure temporary local advantage. If you embarrass this board or interfere with or prevent its free and vigorous action you may be opening the door for the introduction into this country of a new cotton pest more dangerous to and destructive of our cotton crop than even the boll weevil or any other cotton pest with which we now have to contend. I urge you not to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan used only one minute. The Chair will yield one minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail. My colleague [Mr. Sisson] is a constituent of mine [laughter], and I want to protect him from this pink boll worm which has wrought such frightful havoc in the cotton fields of Egypt. While I commend my constituent, of course, for his stand in behalf of the Constitution and his effort to protect the Constitution from the ravages threatened by the Committee on Agriculture, yet I feel that my duty to him as a constituent requires me to plead with this House to protect him and his delta plantation from the ravages of this Egyptian pink worm, which if it is imported into this country will add one more tremendous burden to the cotton farmers of the South and to my district.

As I understand his contention, it is, because the Constitution forbids that any preference shall be given one port over another port, that therefore no quarantine can be declared or enforced at one port unless it be similarly enforced at all other ports. If a quarantine is established at New Orleans or Galveston against yellow fever, then Portland, Me., and Juneau, Alaska, must be quarantined also. I can not believe that this argument will appeal very strongly to the southern cotton growers as a reason for leaving the southern ports open for the importation of this new plague of Egypt, which the department experts declare is more destructive to the cotton plant than the boll weevil.

The department, under the bill as it is now, will quarantine against importations of Egyptian cotton into any southern port where this pink worm can live, and it will do so because it has been discovered that in this way this pest has actually been brought across the seas from Egypt to Boston. If that were the end of it, all would be well, because the worm can not live in New England and reproduce its species; but because some cotton mills in the South are beginning to spin Egyptian cotton they are protesting that this quarantine against southern ports is giving a preference to ports of New England, and this amendment, if adopted, would prevent it.

My colleague says he does not object at all to Egyptian cotton being imported into this country, although it does compete directly with the Bender cotton of the Mississippi Delta. His sole objection is that the law which will forbid the importation through southern ports is unconstitutional.

Then, too, he discounts the damage which this pink worm can do. He says they raise cotton in Egypt in spite of the worm. I may say they raise cotton in Texas in spite of the boll weevil, yet my colleague has always voted for appropriations to prevent the spread of the boll weevil.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, there has been a decided increase recently in importations of Egyptian cotton. I do not wonder that our southern friends are alarmed at that fact. There was also a great increase in the importation of Irish and Bermuda potatoes, and I do not wonder that our friends on the other side, and their Department of Agriculture, took occasion to levy a quarantine up yonder in the State of Maine to protect the Maine farmer from the disastrous effects of a low tariff.

But what I object to in this particular matter is that we should allow one of the departments of this Government to fix the channel depth of our ports and centralize our business at three places. There has been no great alarm over the Egyptian boll weevil. That is largely imaginary, or has been up to this time. In our part of the country we need the raw materials, and we want to buy them and keep the mills going. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] that all our ports should be treated alike. There is not one port from the extreme southern point of the Atlantic coast up to New York that equals in depth of water the ports of New York and Boston, and the department order which the gentleman from Georgia proposes to restrict therefore would close out the other ports where the business of cotton manufacturing along the Atlantic seaboard is conducted. The great ocean leviathans that go into New York can not go into a single South Atlantic port. What we need along the coast is not monopoly at one or two ports, but wholesome competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important proposition which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] has sprung upon the House. The Egyptian pink worm is described to me by experts of the Department of Agriculture as being a cotton pest much more destructive than the boll weevil. Now, what they have done is to quarantine certain southern ports against the importation of Egyptian cotton seed or Egyptian cotton. It is not for the purpose of playing any favoritism to anybody, but for the purpose of protecting our cotton growers of the South, and in my opinion there could not be a worse amendment proposed, as far as the cotton growers are concerned, than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. We have enough of pests now. We are spending thousands of dollars in this bill to fight cotton pests and potato pests and all kinds of pests, and now for us in this amendment to throw the doors wide open to the world and say, "Bring in your pests!"

Mr. BARTLETT. It does not do that—

Mr. LEVER. It does not seem to me to be in keeping with the logic of the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote. I withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have the amendment read again, so that the committee may see that the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from South Carolina have misstated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 74, line 2, by adding at the end of the line, after "\$50,000," the following:

"Provided, That no part of the sum in this paragraph or this act appropriated shall be used or expended in the enforcing of any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture, which have for their purpose and intention to, and do in effect, give preference to the ports of one State over those of another."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to see who will vote for the Constitution, Mr. Chairman, and I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, yeas 63.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Domestic potato quarantine: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with those States in the inspection of Irish potatoes where a quarantine has been or hereafter shall be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, prohibiting the movement of such potatoes from any State into any other State, District, or Territory of the United States except under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and for the enforcement of such rules and regulations, and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, \$50,000.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 74, line 13, by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$100,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, last year there was an appropriation of \$50,000 for the inspection of potatoes in Maine under the quarantine regulations. That was for the fiscal year 1915. Up to the 1st of last December the department was able, with this appropriation, to take care of all the expenses of the inspection. Since December 1, owing to the insufficiency of the appropriation, it has been found necessary to impose a tax of \$2 per car on the potato shippers, which will result, before the Maine crop is moved, in the shippers having to contribute nearly \$50,000 to carry on the Government inspection. In order to prevent that recurring next year I have offered this amendment to increase this appropriation to \$100,000, the amount that is estimated and recommended by the horticultural board.

I believe that the Federal Government should assume the entire expense, for the reason that in the inspection of meats which enter into interstate commerce the Government pays the whole bill. We inspect grain which enters into interstate commerce, and the Government pays the whole bill. Both of these are food products. Potatoes are a food product. The potato shipper in Maine, in my opinion, should be accorded the same treatment that the beef packer and the grain-elevator man receives. I hope that the chairman of this committee will not oppose this increase, which is absolutely necessary to provide sufficient funds for the department to pay the whole expense of the inspection and moving of the potato crop in Maine and relieve the burden now imposed upon the shippers, a burden that in equity should be borne by the Government, as a very small proportion of the great potato crop in Maine is to-day infected; nevertheless the entire crop has to be inspected and will until the quarantine is raised. It costs a good deal to inspect thirty or forty million bushels of potatoes. I appreciate the fact that the department, through the well-directed efforts of the members of the horticultural board and W. Blair Clark, superintendent of this service in Maine, is doing excellent work, and with this appropriation will wipe out the last suspicion of infection and give to Maine potatoes what is their due—a clean bill of health. This inspection is in the interest of the whole country, as Maine seed potatoes enter many States. For that reason the whole expense should be assumed by the Federal Government.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUERNSEY. I will yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. MOORE. The farmers themselves are paying the excess over the appropriation of \$50,000 of the expense not required to make the inspection?

Mr. GUERNSEY. The shippers and the farmers will during the next few months as the crop is shipped from the State.

Mr. MOORE. They have arranged to pay that out of their own pockets?

Mr. GUERNSEY. They will be assessed \$2 a car.

Mr. MOORE. Which is a condition that does not prevail in any other State that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. GUERNSEY. I know of no such situation elsewhere; in fact, as I have already pointed out, the Government in other inspections of food products for shipment pays the whole expense, as the inspection is for the protection of the whole country. If the additional amount is not allowed here, we will have to ask the Senate to make allowance; but the House should provide for it now.

Mr. BRYAN. Maine is a prohibition State. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GUERNSEY) there were—ayes 15, yeas 50.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

International Dry Farming Congress, Denver, Colo.: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Denver, Colo., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid region of the United States, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$20,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. When is this congress to be held?

Mr. LEVER. It is to be held during the year.

Mr. HARRISON. Did not the Secretary of Agriculture state to the committee that it was useless to make this appropriation now?

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary made no recommendation whatever; but I will say to the gentleman that there have been

held about five of these international dry-farming congresses, starting somewhere in Canada. Usually this provision has been put in on the Senate side. Our committee heard gentlemen interested in this proposition, and believing that the item would be put into the bill in the Senate, and believing that it was a good item, agreed to report it. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. It was my impression that the Secretary stated that it would be too late when this congress was held for the appropriation to do any good.

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary of Agriculture did not estimate for this and made no statement about it one way or the other.

Mr. HARRISON. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BOOHER. I make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order just a moment?

Mr. BOOHER. I will reserve the point of order for the present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the International Dry Farming Congress was organized some 10 or 12 years ago and has been doing a great work in the West. I think four years ago we made the first appropriation for representation at that dry-farming congress. Last year we made an appropriation of \$20,000 for the congress at Wichita. At that congress, in my absence, the presidency of it was wished onto me. I may say, therefore, that I am somewhat responsible for this item. It is a great work that is being done out there under the auspices of this congress. We have been appropriating for it in the past. I believe it is a good item. I do not want to ask the House to provide for it on the ground that I am officially connected with the congress, but I want to suggest, as my friend the chairman of the committee has suggested, that the item will probably be put in at the other end of the Capitol in any event, and it seems to me we might quite as well take care of it here. It is a worthy work, and a splendid exhibit will be made.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to him that this congress was held in Kansas last year at Wichita, and the item was put in on the floor of the House largely as a recognition of the personal friendship of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], although all of us recognized that it was really a good educational proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to my friend, further, that the dry-farming congress is to-day doing a work that is adding to the agricultural, particularly to the grain-producing area of the country, vast acreages that heretofore have been considered only useful and valuable for grazing. The dry-farming movement has added a great many more of grain and cereal products to the country and will add a greater area. It deals with the intensified, scientific, thorough farming methods, methods valuable not only to that dry region, but in the country at large. It is a great work, a work that is adding more to the agricultural acreage of the country than any other that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his point of order?

Mr. BOOHER. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams: For cooperation with any State or group of States in the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of navigable streams under the provisions of section 2 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," \$100,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 75, by inserting after line 15 a new paragraph, as follows:

"EXPERIMENTS IN DAIRYING AND LIVE-STOCK PRODUCTION IN SEMIARID AND IRRIGATED DISTRICTS OF THE WESTERN UNITED STATES.

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations and experiments in problems connected with the establishment of dairying and meat production enterprises on the semiarid and irrigated lands of the western United States, including the purchase of live stock, the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$87,500."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to that.

Mr. MARTIN. If the gentleman is going to make the point of order, I want to be heard. If he does not intend to make it, I do not want to take up the time.

Mr. LEVER. I will state the proposition in the committee and let the committee vote on it.



Mr. MARTIN. I do not think the paragraph is subject to a point of order, and I do not care to take up the time with the discussion of it unless the gentleman seriously makes it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from South Dakota is so fine a man that I am going to withdraw the point of order and put the proposition up to the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will withdraw it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time to discuss the point of order unless it is made, in which case I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture made a request for this item as the result of a committee investigation from his department. There is a full statement of the merits of the item in the hearings before the Agricultural Committee. The Secretary asked for two items of this general character. This one I have referred to for dairying in connection with certain public farm experiment stations that the Government is maintaining in the West, one in the Panhandle region in Texas, and the others farther north, covering the Great Plains and some arid regions. He asked for \$60,000 for similar experimental work in the cotton and cane growing regions of the South. In the language of the Scripture, one was taken and the other left. I desire you to consider the request of the Secretary. In his estimate is the following note, which I will read:

NOTE.—This is a new item, and carries an increase of \$87,500. The field stations of the department in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the United States have in the past been devoted almost entirely to the production of crops. Methods have been established on these stations that make it possible now to produce large forage crops in these districts with a considerable degree of success; but such crops are not marketable, for the reason that in most cases there are no near-by cities and there is no demand for them in the immediate neighborhood in which they are produced. The profitable utilization of these crops on the farm, therefore, is essential to successful farming in these regions. For the purpose of establishing proper methods of feeding, along with the natural grazing that is afforded, it is the desire of the department to place live stock at several of the field stations in the semiarid and irrigated districts of the United States, and thereby make the production of field crops profitable and at the same time increase the production of live stock. If this work is provided for, attention will be given both to dairying and meat production, and this will make these field stations serve as guides to the farmers in these regions not only in crop production but also in the profitable utilization of these crops for the production of live stock.

I may say that in the Great Plains area, covering something like 500,000,000 acres, upon which the Government still has in the neighborhood of 300,000,000 acres of public land, there are being carried on efforts to utilize these vast regions by dry-farming methods and otherwise. We have established certain stations for dry farming and experimental work, and they are succeeding in growing varied crops, and every man who goes there—every individual farmer as well as the Government—must depend ultimately upon the utilization of the forage crops far from market by raising live stock and the promotion of dairy interests. The proposal is to carry on dairying in experimental work at these stations, and in that way have some valuable data to pass on to the settler as he comes into the country and help him solve the problem.

In other words, the Government, in an experimental way, is reaching out to conduct this work in aid of the settler because he is not able, in many instances, to do this practical work for himself. They are seeking to learn how to grow forage crops in this area and the use of them, in the way of selection of proper breeds of stock and data of a scientific and statistical kind that will tell the settler, the farmer, whether certain classes are profitable and what are unprofitable, and so help him to solve this great problem, in which the entire country is interested.

The Department of Agriculture, in its efforts to make the results of its work of practical benefit not only to the experiment stations but of practical value to the men who are to be guided by their efforts, should have some opportunity to make these experiments with dairy and other live stock—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting to this committee that they have made a distinction against one section of the country over another, but because of the vast merits of this question I do suggest that if we are to expend

money in only one locality, in an effort to enlarge the stock production and dairy production of this country, it ought to be spent in this vast area of the West, the natural home of the live-stock industry, rather than to put it down in the cane and cotton-growing sections of the South, where there is great doubt whether we can ever develop a great live-stock country or not. The mere fact that the committee put in an item of \$60,000 for this work in the South a year ago, and submits another item appropriating \$60,000 in the next section of this bill, is no reason why the work in such direction should be confined to that section of the country. It is desirable to place a fund in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture to do this experimental work, of value not only to the department but to the settlers who are pioneers of the country in building up these new communities.

Mr. STAFFORD. On the reservation of the point of order, is the gentleman ready to submit the matter to a vote?

Mr. LEVER. I only desire to make a brief statement of one minute.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. It is true the Secretary of Agriculture estimated for it; but the committee in making up this bill did not allow any new projects whatever, although many of them were meritorious, unless the project was in the nature of an absolute emergency. Therefore I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 17, yeas 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$60,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the item.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is fair after the treatment that has been given the gentleman. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, what disposition was made of the item? Has the paragraph gone out?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph went out.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment, which I will offer as a new paragraph, and I wish to have it amended so it will read \$10,000 instead of \$70,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment with the necessary correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY: Page 75, line 26, after the word "elsewhere," strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$10,000," and add the following language: "Provided, That of this amount \$10,000 may be used in one or more of the States in which sugar beets are extensively grown, to make investigations and experiments to determine the value of sugar-beet tops for the feeding of cattle and other live stock."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask where this amendment comes in?

Mr. FORDNEY. The amendment is to the paragraph which was stricken out, but I offer it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I know, but it provides of this amount, and the amount has been stricken out.

Mr. FORDNEY. I offer it in the sum of \$10,000.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell in the open market or to exchange for other live stock such animals or animal products as cease to be needed in the work of the department, and all moneys received from the sale of such animals or animal products or as a bonus in the exchange of the same shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 7, page 76, insert the following:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on experiments and demonstrations in live stock in the Eastern States, including the maintaining in these States breeding animals, to promote the raising of

beef cattle, and to offer prizes and bounties in counties or other subdivisions of the States to encourage the development of the beef-raising industry of these States, \$50,000.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not come in where I expected it might, as the paragraph which related to a similar subject was stricken out on a point of order; nevertheless I wish to address the House briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina reserve the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUERNSEY. For a question.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to know if the gentleman agrees to add five thousand to experiment in dairying.

Mr. GUERNSEY. Mr. Chairman, the reasons I offer this amendment are these: The Secretary of Agriculture in his recent annual report stated, with reference to the decrease of our meat supply, that we could no longer look to the ranges to settle this question; we must look to the settled farming areas of the country for an increase in our meat supply. In order to awaken interest in the raising of more beef in the settled farming areas it seems to me that some action must be taken by the Federal Government.

The proposal set forth in the amendment is just a suggestion of what the Secretary of Agriculture might be authorized to do toward encouraging the raising of beef cattle; Federal prizes and bounties should be much sought after, and undoubtedly would awaken great interest among breeders, and breeding stations established by the Government in the States, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, might be of great value in establishing the right breeds of beef animals.

In New England within the last 20 years they have fallen off something like 250,000 head, and what is true of New England is true also of all the Eastern States, where during that period the shrinkage has been near a million head. If the Federal Government should take some steps that would encourage the industry, or that would attract attention to it, they might revive it in those States, where a very large proportion of our population is and always will be. In the near future I hope to address the House more fully than the present time permits relative to the proposal set forth in the amendment that I have offered.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting some data on the number now and in the past in the Eastern States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Following are the figures referred to:

*Number of cattle on farms and ranges (excluding calves).*

States.	1890	1900	1910
New Jersey.....	212,052	200,299	195,035
Pennsylvania.....	1,705,418	1,475,524	1,350,863
Delaware.....	51,844	44,817	47,833
Maryland.....	267,189	237,181	248,087
Ohio.....	1,763,387	1,558,729	1,581,925
Maine.....	299,110	277,053	224,622
New Hampshire.....	222,888	186,358	149,228
Vermont.....	395,288	400,356	362,741
Massachusetts.....	256,128	242,323	226,845
Rhode Island.....	34,777	30,696	30,375
Connecticut.....	203,661	179,758	174,717
New York.....	2,131,392	2,089,249	1,984,674
Total.....	7,544,136	7,022,343	6,577,575

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. GUERNSEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval stores investigations: For investigating the grading, weighing, and handling of naval stores, and preparation of definite type samples thereof, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$5,000.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the gentleman will not make a point of order to that item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Five thousand dollars is not sufficient to start a bureau.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. This is a very important provision. It only carries \$5,000, and means much to the naval stores industry of the South.

Mr. MOORE. That is the whole trouble. Five thousand dollars would not begin to start a bureau like this, but if the gentleman wishes to make a statement, I will reserve the point.

Mr. HARRISON. If the gentleman would investigate, he would not make a point of order against this provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a similar provision authorizing a leather investigation went out on a point of order, and I think a point of order should be made on this.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not make a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am merely making a statement for the information of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. This item was carried for the first time in the last Agricultural appropriation bill. It affects an industry that has been crippled probably more than any other industry in the country recently. The products of the naval stores industry have just been declared to be contraband of war. They are not allowing resin and other naval stores products now to be shipped to Germany or Austria, and therefore, to a very large extent, the markets of the world have been cut off from the manufactures in this country. They are having a hard time, and everything should now be done to encourage and aid them.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. If I have the floor I will.

Mr. MOORE. Does the grading and handling of naval stores in any way affect the farmer, or the forester, or the man who owns the timber?

Mr. HARRISON. It benefits the man who owns 120 or 160 acres of timberland as well as the manufacturer and the employer in the industry. They have what they call a southern grading of resin and what they call a New York grading—one is a cheaper grading than the other. In other words, the producer might sell his products on the southern grading and the broker resell on the New York grading, thereby obtaining a better price on the grading, where there is little difference in the grading and quality, than the producer obtained. This appropriation is to investigate that difference in the grading and obtain if possible a universal standard of measurement and grading and classification.

Mr. MOORE. I want to ask the gentleman this question, and then I will be through. Is the weighing, grading, and handling of naval stores of more advantage to the farmer or the man who owns the forest and caps the trees than it is to the man who has been heralded here from time to time to-day as a speculator?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, the speculator gets nothing out of this \$5,000 appropriation. It is to protect the producer of resin and spirits of turpentine and aid the men who are actually and bona fide in the business.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman conclude if I withdrew the point of order?

Mr. HARRISON. To be sure; yes. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his point of order. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That not to exceed \$55,000 of the lump-sum appropriations now available or herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats necessary in the conduct of the work of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles and boats, and that such vehicles and boats shall be used only for official service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall on the first day of each regular session of Congress, make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the matter is not subject to a point of order at all. I hope the Chair will pass upon the proposition. I insist that the Chair rule upon the proposition.

Mr. MOORE. This is new legislation, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. No. Two or three Chairmen have ruled on it. I do not care to argue the question. The Chair is familiar with it.



Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire, before the Chair rules, whether this has been provided for in the law; whether there is any statutory law justifying the admission of this new item as legislation upon an appropriation bill?

Mr. LEVER. I hardly think it is necessary to argue the point of order to the Chair. It was passed upon in connection with the Indian appropriation bill and later on the Army bill and held to be in order. I think it is in order on this bill. It is nothing more nor less than a segregation of appropriations.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to produce the statutory law which provides for the inclusion of this item in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair wants that, the gentleman can give it to him.

Mr. MOORE. I ask that because the gentleman does not explain the item and wants the Chair to rule.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair has not the law before him, it is section 5 of the legislative appropriation act for the current year.

Mr. STAFFORD. But, Mr. Chairman, that law that the gentleman from Illinois refers to has no applicability to the Agricultural appropriation bill.

If the Chair will indulge me, the Chair has ruled on the question referred to by the gentleman from Illinois, as a limitation on the action of the department heads in the disbursement of lump-sum appropriations, that there must be specific appropriations for automobile service before the department heads will be authorized to spend the money for that character of service.

Now, the question before the Chair is whether there is any authority in law for the Agricultural Department to invest moneys in automobiles. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] has frequently relied upon the organic act, that its purpose is to acquire and diffuse useful information relating to agriculture. It must be a very far-fetched argument to hold that on that ground you can justify the purchase of anything and everything for the dissemination of information. As far as the Indian Service and the war service and the Postal Service are concerned, it has been held that the character of those services naturally presupposed the having of conveniences, like automobiles, for the use of those services; but I question whether there is any substantive law which authorizes the Agricultural Department to purchase automobiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman this question: If the law directs the Department to do certain things, does it not imply the right of Congress to furnish the means to carry out the duties which the law imposes upon the head of that department?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the Chair is going pretty far in holding—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not held anything yet. The Chair is asking the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should say that any Chairman would be going pretty far to authorize anything which might be held to be a means of conveyance or communication.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the matter is very simple. It would be silly to say, first, that the Department of Agriculture could not expend any money for transportation. It would be ridiculous to say that they could not spend any money for the payment of freight charges. Yet there is no distinction between one kind of transportation and another. Years ago, on the military bill, the Chairman held distinctly that Congress had the same power to provide motor vehicles that it had to provide for the payment of freight charges; that it was all transportation; and that same ruling has been followed ever since. It is only for Congress in its judgment to determine how much the appropriation shall be. We could segregate the amount which we would allow to be expended for freight charges, as far as the appropriation is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there is no doubt that this provision is in order, for the reasons heretofore given, and the point of order is overruled.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 76, line 19, strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what the boats are used for that are authorized to be purchased under this section of the bill?

Mr. LEVER. There will be 3 used in the Biological Survey and 26 of them in the Forest Service. They use a great many motor boats in the Forest Service in Alaska and Florida.

Mr. MADDEN. All right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman having reduced the amount available for the purchase of new boats, does he mean to leave the same amount available for the general purposes of the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I do, for the reason that after the bill was printed it came to my information from the department that the maintenance allowance was not sufficient, and I looked into the matter thoroughly and became satisfied that that statement is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter all moneys received from, or deducted in settlements with, carriers on account of the loss of, or damage to, any property of the Department of Agriculture shall be credited to the appropriations or funds out of which the same was purchased.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter, in case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during each fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the purchase and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of property contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease: *Provided*, That any such expenditure may be made only upon the written assent of the President: *Provided further*, That a detailed statement of any such expenditure shall be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I concede it, and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from South Carolina offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during the fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the purchase and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of property contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease: *Provided*, That any such expenditure may be made only upon the written assent of the President: *Provided further*, That a detailed statement of any such expenditure shall be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. I do not see that it differentiates from the paragraph that just went out on a point of order, except that the paragraph undertook to make it permanent law, whereas this is new legislation and is legislation on an appropriation bill, not estimated for, and there is no law for it. On that ground I make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I presume the provisos are subject to a point of order. Certainly the last one is; but I take it the gentleman has no desire to strike out the provisos if the rest of the amendment goes in.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; that would not effect the purpose I have in view.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order on the proviso?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. No; I make the point of order on the amendment as a whole. If one goes out, all go out. I make the point of order on the entire paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Of course the proviso is subject to the point of order.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. And therefore the whole amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Will not the gentleman from North Carolina reserve the point of order one moment?

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Of course.

Mr. LEVER. In order that I may make a very frank statement.

Mr. MANN. Let us offer such an amendment that we can get a ruling on the question, and not on an incident.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order, and offer the following amendment. Will the Clerk read the amendment again, striking out both provisos?

Mr. MANN. Offer an amendment down to and including the word "disease," in line 15.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the Clerk report the amendment as now offered?

Mr. LEVER. It is to strike out the word "hereafter" in line 6, page 77, and on line 11 insert the word "the" for "each," and put a period after the word "disease" in line 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after line 5, page 77, the following:

"In case of an emergency arising out of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals, which in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend during the fiscal year, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease."

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, frankly I do not think that the point of order would lie against that amendment and I do not make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 77, after line 22, the following paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out an agreement heretofore made by and between him and the State of Washington, through its proper officers, looking to the exchange of lands and indemnity rights with said State, \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be available until expended when the said State shall have made available a like amount to be used for carrying out the aforesaid agreement: *Provided*, That such exchanges shall be made on the basis of approximately equal area and value."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will only take a minute or two to explain this. This is offered at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the reason why it was not included in the original bill was that the agreement between the department and the State of Washington was not entered into until the bill had been reported.

In the exterior limits of the forest reservations in the State of Washington, including the Olympus Monument, is 500,000 acres that belonged to school lands of the State of Washington. For several years we have been trying to reach an agreement whereby the land could be exchanged so as to be in a compact body, in order that the State might be able to make use of the lands and in order that the Government might not be put to the expense of caring for that 500,000 acres. This is quite a burden resting on the National Government in protecting it from fire. The State is willing to bear this expense when they take charge of it. In addition to that, the State is prohibited from cutting the timber on the land, and much of this is already overripe.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I wish to say to the gentleman that South Dakota effected an exchange exactly as is proposed by this amendment for the State of Washington. The Secretary of the Interior has recently held that he will not ratify the exchange, for two or three reasons. Among others is the reason that under the constitution of the State of South Dakota, which is identical with that of the State of Washington, the school lands could not be disposed of for less than \$10 an acre, and that the State of South Dakota could not convey to the United States a good title in exchange, such as proposed by these exchanges that are contemplated and that have been made.

In connection with the proposition of South Dakota, we had expected to offer an amendment to this or some other bill, but we were advised by the Interior Department that they would oppose it, and that they thought the matter ought to go over until it had been fully looked into and until it was decided just what could be done in order to make the exchange valid. I doubt very much, if the proposition of the gentleman should become a law, whether it would accomplish what he is attempting by this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Secretary has asked for it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What Secretary?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What does the Secretary of the Interior say about it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this question is of too much importance to be decided at this point and at this late hour, and I make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I hope the gentleman will withhold it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold it if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have not much more to say, except that this is an advantage both to the Government and the State of Washington. This appropriation has to be made before the State appropriates its part. The State of Washington appropriates an equal amount to survey these lands. The conditions are that a great deal of timber is being wasted, timber that is ripe and can not be cut; and also timber killed by fire that can not be used.

The Government would save enough money in two or three years to pay its part of the expense.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to pass on the merits of this proposition to-night, and therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. There have been half a dozen like cases within the last hour; why did not the gentleman make a point of order against them also?

Mr. STAFFORD. This matter has been up in the committee, as I understand, and some members voted adversely on it, and, therefore, there are two sides to the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. All right, if the gentleman constitutes himself the guardian of these matters; but he ought to be fair about it and not single out one item and make a point of order against it and let the rest be passed upon by a vote of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, \$22,627,712.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at the close of the bill in order to put in some very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the last item in this bill reads: "Total carried by this bill for the Department of Agriculture, \$22,627,712." This amount, together with about \$5,000,000 permanent appropriations, makes the grand total of about \$27,000,000, in round numbers, appropriated for agriculture for the next fiscal year. I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that this money brings the best returns of any money appropriated by Congress.

When I first came to Congress the appropriations for this great business of agriculture amounted, in round numbers, to about \$3,000,000. From year to year I advocated an increase of this amount, in proportion to some extent at least, to the increase and development of the great agricultural interests throughout the country, and I am glad that my efforts, together with others who agreed with me in this regard, have not been in vain, but have borne fruit to the benefit of all the people. I am a strong believer in this great department and its great work and increasing usefulness. In my judgment no department does as much for the general welfare of all the people as does this department of our magnificent Government. I read some statistics a few days ago which to me were very interesting. They are as follows:

#### A HALF CENTURY OF AMERICAN PROGRESS.

Since 1850 the population of the United States has more than quadrupled; there are now more than 100,000,000 people in this country.

During the past 50 years the foreign commerce of the United States has grown from \$318,000,000 to \$4,259,000,000, and the per capita value of exports from \$16.90 to \$23.27.

The national wealth has increased from \$7,000,000,000 to \$140,000,000,000.

The amount of money in circulation has increased from \$279,000,000 to \$3,419,000,000.

The value of farm property has increased from \$4,000,000,000 in 1850 to \$41,000,000,000 in 1910.

In 1850 there were 9,021 miles of railways in operation in the United States, and to-day there are approximately 260,000 miles.

The yearly output of factories in 1859 was \$1,000,000,000; now it is over \$20,000,000,000.

These statistics should be, and no doubt are, very gratifying to every true American citizen.

Whence comes this marvelous increasing wealth? Primarily, from agriculture, because it is the foundation of all our prosperity. Take away our farmers and agriculture, the result of their labors, and we would have no foreign commerce, no farm property, no railroads, no factories, no cities; but our onward march would cease, our foreign commerce would disappear, our factories would go to ruin, our railroad trains would stand still, and our centers of trade would become waste places.



[Applause.] Therefore the necessity of this great department and the manifest justice of the appropriations to sustain it in its great and continually expanding fields of activity.

In this connection I commend to the membership of the House the following poem written by S. E. Kizer, of Chicago, the city of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MANN]. I clipped it from the Industrial Educator, of Tippah County, published at Chalybeate, Miss., which paper was sent to me by my good friend, Mr. John D. Bell, of Walnut, Miss. I commend it to you not alone for its beautiful sentiment, but because of the genuine truth it contains. It is as follows:

THE MAN BEHIND THE PLOW.

[By S. E. Kizer in Chicago Herald.]

They sing about the glories of the man behind the gun,  
And the books are full of stories of the wonders he has done;  
There's something sort o' thrillin' in the flag that's wavin' high,  
And it makes you want to holler when the boys go marchin' by;  
But when the shoutin's over and the fightin's done, somehow  
We find we're still dependin' on the man behind the plow.

In all the pomp and splendor of an army on parade,  
And through the awful darkness that the smoke of battle's made;  
In the halls where jewels glitter and where shouting men debate;  
In the palaces where rulers deal out honors great,  
There is not a single person who'd be doin' bizness now  
Or have medals if it wasn't for the man behind the plow.

We're buildin' mighty cities and we're gainin' lofty heights,  
We're winnin' lots of glory and we're settin' things to rights;  
We're a-showin' all creation how the world's affairs should run;  
Future men'll gaze in wonder at the things we have done,  
And they'll overlook the feller, just the same as they do now,  
Who's the whole concern's foundation—that's the man behind the plow.

[Applause.]

How true it is that "there is not a single person who'd be doin' bizness now or have medals if it wasn't for the man behind the plow." For this reason I have fought for his interest, welfare, and prosperity as best I could since I have been in Congress, and expect to continue to do so so long as I am honored by a seat in this historic hall of the House of Representatives. In helping him I help everybody in my district, State, and Nation. I will never consent to take anything away from him he now has, but will always help to aid him in every possible way in his manly fight for humanity and this great Republic. I will not even consent to deprive him of the garden and flower seed, but permit me to say that it gives me pleasure to send them to every man, woman, boy, and girl in my district who will write me a postal and request me to send them a package. From the smallest to the largest benefit we can bestow, I am for them all. I am just as ready to serve all my other constituents, as I feel sure they would readily testify, because nothing makes me happier than to be useful to them all and to "scatter sunshine in the pathway of all" and bring gladness and joy to their hearts and happiness to their homes every time it is possible to do so. Allow me, in conclusion, to thank all who have aided us of the Committee on Agriculture to pass this splendid bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 74, the paragraph beginning in line 21, for the purpose of withdrawing a point of order which was made against the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may offer an amendment that went out on a point of order making appropriations for an exhibit at the International Dry Farming Congress, at Denver, Colo., in October, as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri made a request for unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 74. Was there objection to returning to it?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman did not understand my request. My request is for unanimous consent to offer this as a new paragraph at this point at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time at the end of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain his amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. It is a paragraph against which a point of order was made.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is all right, Mr. Chairman, I think.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HEFLIN. This proposition went out on a point of order of the gentleman from Missouri, and he desires to return for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to let it go back in the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman will not object. The gentleman probably does not understand it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment at the present time. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry: Is it necessary to get unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that it is not.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and report the bill and amendments to the House with recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MONDELL. Is there not a motion now pending? There certainly is.

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Washington made a motion to amend.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not offer an amendment but submitted a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRYAN. I offered the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late; the gentleman from South Carolina has made a motion.

The question was taken, and the motion that the committee rise was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 20415, and had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the following amendment. After line 20, page 74, I move to insert the following.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 20, on page 74, insert the following:

"International Dry Farming Congress, Denver, Colo.: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the next annual meeting of the International Dry Farming Congress, to be held at Denver, Colo., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, illustrative of the investigations, products, and processes relating to farming in the subhumid region of the United States, including labor and all expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$20,000."

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The SPEAKER. What is the point of order.

Mr. SISSON. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill and that it has been held out of order in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. It was ruled out of order.

Mr. LEVER. It is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RECONSIDERING ACTION ON H. R. 20818.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday we passed the bill H. R. 20818, which was a bridge bill, and in the bill it refers to the general bridge act as an act approved March 29, 1906. It is a typographical error and should be the act of March 23, and I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings sending the bill to engrossment and third reading and passage be vacated and that the error be corrected by making it March 23, and the bill be again put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all proceedings on the bill H. R. 20818 be vacated back to the amendment period. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois is agreed to, and without objection the bill is ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

There was no objection.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, upon the request of Mr. NEELY of West Virginia, Mr. BROWN of West Virginia was granted leave of absence for one week on account of personal illness.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, January 29, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules and lists of papers, documents, etc., on the files of the Treasury Department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1528), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. FIELDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5495) authorizing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of condemned cannon and cannon balls, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1331), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21159) to amend section 4 of the act of April 21, 1910, entitled "An act to protect the seal fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1332), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARNER, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 672) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit to the House of Representatives all facts in his possession with reference to the conduct of the collector of customs of the Laredo district, in the State of Texas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1329), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3878) to validate certain homestead entries, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1336), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21126) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *General Garretson* to *S. H. Robbins*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1330), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KEY of Ohio, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21218) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1328), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1377) for the relief of Alfred S. Lewis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1334), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12075) to correct the military record of A. W. Suduth, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1335), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18884) for the relief of Daniel Jordan, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1333), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 20908) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Wilkinson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 21219) providing that the Panama Canal rules shall govern in measurement of vessels for imposing tolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 21220) to amend paragraph 2 of section 3264 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 5 of the act of March 1, 1879, and as further amended by the act of Congress approved June 22, 1910, and to amend section 3285 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by section 3 of the act of May 28, 1889, and as further amended by the act approved June 22, 1910; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21235) to detach Pecos County, in the State of Texas, from the Del Rio division of the western judicial district of Texas and attach same to the San Angelo division of the northern judicial district of said State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 21236) to dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY: Resolution (H. Res. 714) authorizing the printing of President's message vetoing immigration bill (H. R. 6000); to the Committee on Printing.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21218) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 21221) granting a pension to John F. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21222) granting a pension to Frank E. Welch; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 21223) granting a pension to Carolina Reichold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21224) for the relief of Carrie Stevens Todd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 21225) granting a pension to Ellen Hammon Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 21226) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Parish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21227) granting a pension to Nancy Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 21228) granting an honorable discharge to John Berrien; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21229) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21230) for the relief of the estate of Alexander Shock; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 21231) granting a pension to Mahala Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 21232) granting a pension to Smith Gee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 21233) granting a pension to Charles Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 21234) granting an increase of pension to Francis J. Jamart; to the Committee on Pensions.



## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of H. R. 18666, S. 6856, the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of German-American Alliance of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BORCHERS: Petition of citizens of Broadlands, Ill., favoring embargo on all war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANTOR: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill, H. R. 18666; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Herman Valet, Robert Podratz, Frank Hoppe, Henry Kammerer, P. O. Phillips, Richard Becker, Frederick Raduege, and 361 others, all residents of Milwaukee County, in the State of Wisconsin, indorsing and urging the passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring an embargo on all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Memorial of German Methodist Episcopal Church, of Paterson, N. J., favoring passage of bills to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Iron City Central Trades Council, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring an embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of L. S. Freeland, of Change, N. J., and F. E. Langstrath, of Montclair, N. J., favoring the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FARR: Petition of St. Stanislaus Society, Polish National Alliance, and Polish Roman Catholic Associates, all of Old Forge; Polish National Alliance of Throop; John Gasienco, of Carbondale; Polish National Alliance of Minooka; Zwiastku Narathowego Polskiego, Lackawanna County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Hoffman, Lafayette County, Shumway, Centralia, Effingham County, and Wakefield; Catholic Union of Effingham; citizens of St. Peter; and Central Verein of America, of St. Rose, all in the State of Illinois, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petition of Matthew Kilguss, Providence, R. I., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Kent County Pomona Grange, Hope, R. I., protesting against rural free delivery being conducted on a private-contract basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Martin S. Fanning and Karl P. Wallin, of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of civil-service-reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Henry P. Ryder, Patrick S. Donlan, Joseph E. Donahue, James P. Walsh, Arthur L. Conaty, and James J. Daly, of Providence, R. I., urging the protection of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Louis A. Woll, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Wesley M. Oler, New York City, and Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against the export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of Louis H. Meyer and other citizens of Missouri, favoring House joint resolution 377 to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of citizens of Lutherville, Ark., to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protest against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Polish National Alliance, Local 940, Denning, Ark., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, protests of D. C. Porter, of Little Rock, and J. F. Williams, of Center Ridge, Ark., against amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Polish Federation, U. S. A., 70, headquarters Argenta, Ark., against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEISTER: Memorial of mass meeting at Monessen, Pa., favoring amendment to abolish polygamy in United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Italian Protective Association, of Greensburg, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Patrick A. Donlan, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the treatment of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 24 citizens of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring an embargo on all war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Joseph Mackay, South Norwalk, Conn., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of S. S. Thompson Co., New Haven, and the Bridgeport Hardware Manufacturing Corporation, Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Francis Ryter, Hartford, Conn., protesting against passage of Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Memorial of Forest Park Business Men's Association, urging the adoption of House joint resolution 372, for national security commission to inquire into preparedness of the United States in case of war; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petitions of citizens of Norwich, Conn., and vicinity, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, to prohibit the export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of St. Stanislaus Society, of Norwich, and the Polish Catholic Society, of Rockville, all in the State of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Grand Haven, Sparta, and Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against the passage of the ship-purchase bill, House bill 18666; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring Hamill civil-service reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of citizens of Providence, R. I., favoring protection for the Catholic clergy in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Carl Kruger and other citizens of the United States, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: Petition of citizens of Slayden, Tenn., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Slayden, Tenn., favoring rural-credit legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of Tw. Swt. Jozefa, Jamesburg; St. Joseph's Society, Perth Amboy; and Polish Roman Catholic Union, Sayreville, all in the State of New Jersey, against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of sundry citizens and societies of the State of California, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Society T. Kosciusko, Branch 1751, of the T. National, Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Don S. Ford, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Pasadena (Cal.) Audubon Society and Alice W. Pittman, Elizabeth P. Evans, Lydia Pike, and Ellen L. Garwood, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against shipment of American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., urging Congress to invite all nations to join us in a world federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Harvey H. Duryee, of Los Angeles, Cal., relative to the Zeppelin raid on England and urging protest by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of supervisors of Solano County, Cal., favoring passage of civil-service retirement bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 31 American citizens and citizens of Mankota and vicinity, to lay an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Louisiana, protesting against export of war material by United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 29, 1915.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 26, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hollis	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Brandegge	James	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Catron	Johnson	Overman	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones	Page	Stone
Chilton	Kenyon	Perkins	Swanson
Culberson	Kern	Pittman	Thomas
Cummins	La Follette	Ransdell	Thompson
Dillingham	Lippitt	Reed	Thornton
Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson	Tillman
Gallinger	McCumber	Saulsbury	Townsend
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gronna	Myers	Sheppard	White
Hitchcock	Nelson	Simmons	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NORRIS obtained the floor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had intended to continue the discussion of the bill this morning, but I gladly yield to the Senator from Nebraska, and will follow the Senator from Nebraska when he concludes.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I ask consent to have printed and lie on the table two amendments to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I take it that all of us, without regard to party affiliation and without regard to the section of the country from which we come, are in favor of building up our merchant marine and are also in favor of lending whatever legitimate assistance we can in a legislative way to the upbuilding of American shipping on the high seas.

As to the methods that we should follow in improving our merchant marine or building up our shipping, there is great difference of opinion. I desire to concede, to begin with, that there is ground for difference of opinion. I have always been one of those who have opposed the building up of our merchant marine by a subsidy from the Treasury. I concede, however, that there are two sides to that question, and I am not questioning the fidelity or the patriotism of those who think we ought to resort to a direct subsidy. I have opposed this method,

however, ever since I have been in Congress, and I formed the opinion myself several years ago that a better and more practical way would be for the Government itself to build such ships as might be necessary for our Navy in time of war, and that those ships, in time of peace, should be used through the instrumentality of a governmental corporation or some other method that would put them in use. It has never seemed to me proper to pay enormous subsidies to private parties to keep their ships on the high seas and then when we needed them, if ever, in time of danger we would be compelled again to pay for the ships themselves.

Several years ago I offered an amendment in the House of Representatives to the naval appropriation bill, the substance of which and the effect of which would have been, if adopted, to provide for the building of vessels by the Government and their use in time of peace through the instrumentality of the Panama Railroad Co. When the Alaskan railroad bill was before the Senate I offered a similar amendment here. It was, however, defeated by quite a large vote.

These introductory statements I make simply to show that I feel friendly to the method provided in this bill for the building up of a merchant marine through the instrumentality of a corporation. If I had my way about it, I would change the bill in several respects regarding this corporation with a view of keeping it from under the control of political influence, but my objection to the details of the bill in that respect are not sufficient to preclude me from voting for the bill if it had attached to it two amendments of which I desire to speak this morning.

I think it is to be regretted that this measure is made a partisan one and that it is drafted in caucus so that any amendments which may be offered here will necessarily be voted down unless they are taken up by the committee and by the committee referred to the caucus and receive favorable action there. I am in earnest about the amendments I am suggesting, and I wish it were possible that they might be taken up in this way with a view of having them considered. I have just as much interest and I think others have the same interest in the drafting of a proper law and in its proper consideration as anyone on the other side of the Chamber.

There is one respect in which I differ very materially from the President in his advocacy of a measure of this kind, and one of the amendments that I had printed yesterday, and which is now on the desks of all Senators, has to do with that part of the bill carrying out the President's idea that when through the instrumentality of this corporation we engage in business and build it up and make it profitable we shall immediately withdraw from it and let private parties take it up. My own idea is that if we go into the business and build up a line of trade or commerce with any of the foreign countries of the world or of domestic commerce and it becomes profitable we should, through the instrumentality of this same corporation, remain in the business and let the taxpayers of the country share the profits as well as bear the losses incidental to the building up of the business.

I believe the idea of the President in his message was not that we should make money out of the transaction, and I am not advocating going into it because I would like to see the Government make money out of it. There are two objects in view—one to build up the merchant marine and the other to put these ships to beneficial use when they are not needed as a merchant marine. Incidentally it will improve our shipping; incidentally it will perhaps decrease the rates somewhat; but I believe it ought to be the permanent policy of the Government. I am not in favor of going into it as a temporary proposition, and would rather stay out of it entirely than to go in only to build up a profitable business for somebody else to reap the benefit at the expense of the taxpayers of the country after it has been built up.

The President, in his message delivered on the 8th day of December, in speaking of the desirability of this kind of legislation, used the language I shall read. I will quote that particular part of his message in which he lays down the idea that we should not remain permanently in the business. The President said:

It may seem a reversal of the natural order of things, but it is true, that the routes of trade must be actually opened—by many ships and regular sailings and moderate charges—before streams of merchandise will flow freely and profitably through them.

Again, he said:

The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them, or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable.